

1 ✓ - Club H. Carter 895  
DOMINION OF CANADA.

---

PRINCIPLES, POLICY

AND

PLATFORM

OF THE

LIBERAL PARTY

---

Copies of this Pamphlet can be had by Liberal Candidates from  
ALEXANDER SMITH, Secretary Ontario Liberal Association,  
34 Victoria Street, Toronto.

TORONTO :

WARWICK BROS. & RUTTER, PRINTERS, 68 AND 70 FRONT ST. WEST  
1895.

F5912.1895. L613D

## TO THE READER.

This pamphlet is intended as an aid to young men and others who wish to work on behalf of Liberalism and good principles. No one can suppose that in so limited a space more than a small fraction of the shortcomings and misdeeds of the Conservative party can be alluded to. While some attention is paid to the system that has prevailed at Ottawa for the past sixteen years and more, the chief place is given to a short sketch of the Principles, Policy, and Platform of the Liberal party. There are also hints for organization, a few remarks upon the Patron Platform, and a very brief sketch of Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the Dominion Liberal leader. In compiling this little document parliamentary reports and debates of the session of 1894 have been resorted to, but where later authoritative facts could be obtained they have been used. This point should not be forgotten so that when later blue books and parliamentary reports are produced there may be no misunderstanding.

This pamphlet is not for general distribution. It is for speakers, committeemen and other workers on behalf of the cause of Liberalism and good government. Copies of the Platform, however, for general distribution can be had upon application to

ALEXANDER SMITH,  
Secretary Ontario Liberal Association,  
34 Victoria Street,  
Toronto.

January, 1895.

*The* EDITH and LORNE PIERCE  
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA



*Queen's University at Kingston*

# THE LIBERAL LEADER.

In Hon. Wilfrid Laurier the Liberal party has a leader worthy to wear the mantle of leadership which has descended in line of succession from such men as Robert Baldwin, George Brown, Alexander Mackenzie and Edward Blake. He is a born leader of men, firm, patient, steadfast of purpose, high minded, Liberal in every thought, and thoroughly Canadian in his every ambition and aspiration for this country. His charming eloquence as a speaker is known everywhere in the Dominion. In his oratory, he combines with the direct and practical qualities of the Englishman, aesthetic and magnetic characteristics of the highest attractiveness. Although of French-Canadian origin, a fact in which he takes pardonable pride, he has been a close student of English history, and a follower of English Liberalism. His political principles and love of liberty have come to him through the same fountains from which his fellow Liberals of British origin have drawn their inspiration. As a parliamentarian he is the peer of the most skilful and resourceful of his contemporaries. He has made no mistakes or mis-steps since his accession to the leadership in 1887, either in Parliament or face to face with the people in the country. He fought the general elections in 1891 with a manliness, vigor and temperateness which drew from his opponents words of unusual praise and respect. Since 1887 he has visited Ontario every year at least once, and sometimes oftener to address the people of this province. In 1894 he not only toured Ontario, but went to Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia. He has also made personal acquaintance with the Maritime Provinces. Through the means of these visits he has created a profound impression throughout the Dominion, not less by his earnestness, frankness and the vigor with which he discusses public affairs than the magnetism of his personality and the brilliancy of his eloquence. He has become more than a party chief; he is a national leader to whom Canadians of whatever province, origin, condition or creed look as the exponent of the principles of freedom of trade, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience. For nearly 25 years he has been a representative of the people in Parliament. His qualities as a citizen and a statesman have become thoroughly known to the public; and by opponents as well as friends, after his long and severe ordeal, is admitted to be a statesman of broad, liberal and patriotic aspirations, and as a man stands before the people of Canada without fear and without reproach.



# PRINCIPLES OF THE LIBERAL PARTY.

Every form of government seems to involve two political elements. The one calling for changes in existing institutions, for relief from the traditions of the past, for a freer citizenship in everything that the name implies—the other not unprogressive in every respect, but nevertheless disposed to resist advanced legislation, the enlargement of the privileges of the many or any recognition of citizenship which can be successfully resisted. These two political forces have been differently named in different countries, and sometimes have been differently named at different periods in the same country. The Whigs and Tories of forty years ago in Great Britain are the Liberals and Conservatives of to-day. But generally in all the Colonies of the Empire, as well as in the Empire itself, the two political parties are recognized by the terms Liberals and Conservatives, and these two terms measurably well represent the policy of the two parties.

In following out the history of the Liberal party in Canada, one is struck with the close analogy between the movements which it supported and by which it is divided from the Conservatives, and movements of a similar character, although on a larger scale, in the history of British politics. It may be that the interchange of opinions between Canada and the Empire had something to do with maintaining the uniformity of political cleavage on kindred subjects, or it may be that the emigrant to Canada carried with him his British politics. At all events, it is some source of gratification for the Liberals of Canada to know that the great movements they inaugurated and to which they consecrated all their energies were movements similar in kind and principle to those which received the support of the great Liberal statesmen of England. When a Canadian on the floor of Parliament or on a public platform declares that no government should make religious opinions a test of citizenship, it might be gratifying to know that such views were entertained by Lord John Russell, John Bright, W. E. Gladstone and all the Liberal lights of the last century. Similarly, when a demand is made for greater freedom of trade, for the extension of the franchise, the protection of the elector at the ballot box, the sovereignty of the people in all matters pertaining to government, purity in the administration of public affairs, the personal integrity of the representatives of the people, these and kindred measures of vast importance to the state have been the watchwords of the Liberal party in Great Britain since the great revolution, and have occupied the thoughts of our ablest and purest statesmen, notably those representing the Liberal party. The historical perspective then of Canadian Liberalism is most satisfactory as well as instructive and would well repay fuller investigation.\*

The Liberal party first asserted itself in Upper Canada by boldly protesting against the tyranny of the "Family Compact" and by demanding (1) the exclusion from office of all appointees of the Government; (2) the entire control of all the revenues of the country; and (3) the responsibility of the executive, i.e., the Government, to the people's representatives in Parliament. One of the earliest champions of these reforms was Wm. Lyon Mackenzie, who as a member of Parliament and, as a journalist, had ample opportunities of calling public attention to the grievances from which relief was desirable. Although Mr. Mackenzie did not conduct the agitation for the reforms which he demanded, at all times with becoming moderation, yet he drew very distinctly a line of separation between the progressive policy of true Liberalism and the claims of Conservatives of that time by "divine right" to occupy all the public offices and to hold the reins of Government, with the public consent when they could, and without public approval when they dared.\*\*

After the Union of 1841, the distinctive character of Liberal principles was represented by Mr. Robert Baldwin, who will always be remembered as the sturdy champion of responsible Government. Mr. Baldwin held that all appointments to office should be made by the Governor-General on the recommendation of his advisers, and that a Government that could not command a majority of the members of Parliament should at once give place to a Government having a majority.

\*See Gladstone and his Contemporaries, by Thomas Archer; Life of John Bright, Richard Cobden, Lord John Russell's Reminiscences, Life of the Earl of Shaftesbury, Gladstone's Speeches.

\*\*See Life of Wm. Lyon Mackenzie by Charles Lindsay.

Another question that at a very early period accentuated the difference between the two political parties was the secularization of the Clergy Reserves. The Liberals believed in the complete separation of Church and State. The Conservatives in Canada, like the Conservatives in England, believed in a State Church, and for years the Anglican Church was the only Church in Canada that drew upon the Government for its support. The Established Church of Scotland demanded assistance from the State, on the ground that it had legal recognition in Scotland, and was latterly recognized as entitled to State aid. The secularization of the Clergy Reserves in 1854 was owing to the efforts of the Liberal party, and if the party is only true to its past history, it will never consent to any entangling alliances between Church and State in the interests of any denomination whatsoever. If the Liberalism of Canada teaches one thing more distinctly than another, it is that all men, irrespective of their religious opinions, have equal rights and privileges before the law.

One of the unexpected and unanticipated results arising out of the Union Act of 1841 was the rapid increase in the population of Upper Canada as compared with Lower Canada. By the Union Act the two Provinces were given equal representation in Parliament; at first forty-five members and later sixty-five. The greater population of Upper Canada, as well as its greater wealth, was not proportionately represented on the floor of Parliament, and many Liberals took the ground that Upper Canada should be represented according to her population. Out of this agitation a good deal of dissension arose, and as might be expected, the people of Quebec were almost unanimous in their opposition to such a change. Mr. George Brown, who was then leader of the Liberal party and editor of the *Toronto Globe*, pressed the case for the Liberals upon the attention of Parliament and the country with unusual vigor, and as a solution for the Governmental difficulties, proposed the federation of Upper and Lower Canada with the Maritime Provinces. The accomplishment of that federation by the B.N.A. Act of 1867 is one of the most signal triumphs of Liberalism which the history of Canada affords.\*

Since Confederation the Liberal party has advocated with great energy, and in some cases successfully, the following measures:

First, and always, the connection of Canada with the British Empire.

(2). The economical and honest expenditure of public moneys, the letting of all public contracts to the lowest tender, the erection of public buildings in the public interest and not in the interest of any locality.

(3). The strict observance of the terms of the federal compact. No "better terms" to one Province without the consent of all parties. No subsidies for any public purpose to one Province unless the work subsidized could fairly be said to be of interest to the whole Dominion. No attempt to encroach upon the rights of any Province, as in the veto on "The Rivers and Streams Bill," the refusal to ratify the Boundary Award of 1878, the seizure upon the revenues from licenses by the McCarthy Act.

(4). The extension of the franchise and the adoption of Provincial franchises for Dominion purposes, the preservation as far as possible of the political boundaries for the constituencies for Provincial and Dominion purposes, the abolition of all offices connected with the revision of the voters' lists and the abolition of all gerrymandering henceforth and forever.

(5). The reduction of the tariff as far as the necessities of the revenue will permit with the complete elimination of every feature of the tariff of a distinctively protective character.

(6). The enlargement of the trade of Canada by means of treaties where treaties can be made that will not endanger the political integrity of the country. This includes the right conceded to Canada to make her own treaties, provided such treaties are not opposed to Imperial interest.

There are a number of other questions, such as temperance, the superannuation of public officers, the abolition of Government House, etc., on which the Liberal party has ranked itself in opposition to certain lines pursued by Conservatives, and no

---

\*See Life of Alexander Mackenzie, Life of Sir John Macdonald.

doubt the views of the Liberal party, expressed by their leaders in Parliament, will yet prevail.

The conclusion of the whole matter, briefly put, is this: The Liberal party is a party of hope. It grows upon the decay of the principles opposed to it; its leaves have always the freshness of Spring about them. It appeals to the hearts and consciences of the people for support; it seeks office only to advance the public interests; it levies taxes only for the interest of the taxpayer; it asks for new legislation only that constitutional government may be strengthened and the rights of citizenship enlarged. There is no better way of fulfilling one's whole duty to the country than to be guided, moved and governed by Liberal motives and principles.

---

## ORGANIZE AND WORK NOW.

One of the speakers of the Anti-Corn-Law League in Great Britain thus described what by some would be considered the most important of all the lessons to be deduced from the agitation: "What men shall inquire in what way they may overthrow some hoary abuse protected by power, surrounded and defended by wealth, rank and corruption—when they would learn whether they may venture to hope that, by exertion, toil and sacrifice, they can bring such an abuse to the ground—they shall turn to the pages which shall record the history of the Anti-Corn-Law League; they shall therein learn that voluntary association will work greater miracles than the hands of them who reared the Pyramids; that bloodless revolution may be brought about by the agitation of men's minds; that there are weapons that cannot be struck down in the warfare; that there is a power which though impalpable and invisible, is yet universal and irresistible and will outlive Ministers and Governments and States, and rule the world when man is man indeed."

Canadians are now engaged in a great trade discussion and can with profit weigh well the words above quoted.

In order then that the political issues of the day may be brought clearly before the people it is necessary for each one interested in the welfare of our country to do all in his power to form associations for the purpose of arousing the electors to a sense of their duty, and inducing them to attend to the practical work of a campaign. There should be no faltering now, and each man should consider it his duty to see to it that a meeting of the committee is at once called for his Polling District. It may be called by the chairman or secretary of the polling district by notice in the local newspaper, an announcement in the schoolhouse or at some public place of assembly, or if there is no committee, by two or three friends getting together, and after devising some plan for calling a meeting "pass the word along" and thus begin. By a judicious use of this pamphlet speeches on the principles, policy and platform of the Liberal party can well be delivered by local men, and once the work is begun no effort should be spared to keep up the interest by social and other gatherings. Speaking alone is not all that is necessary and after the Polling District committee is efficiently organized, with a chairman, vice-chairmen (as many as may be necessary) and a secretary-treasurer and sub-committees appointed, a couple of copies of the Dominion voters' lists should be immediately secured, through your candidate, and from now until the election day is over each name should be carefully considered, and gradually efficient and responsive arrangements made for polling every vote favorable to the Liberal candidate. In conducting this work the co-operation of every association in your district advocating Liberal principles ought to be enlisted, but the whole work should be under the direction of the general committee for the Polling District. The sub-committees can meet at private residences and go over the names of a portion of the Polling District, and at the general meeting report. Everything should be thoroughly done, and some one person held responsible for the placing of every voter, so that on election day there may be no confusion.



At all meetings, after some speech-making, the lists should be studied for a time. By holding these meetings NOW and thus becoming familiar with the issues and the work to be done Liberals will find themselves ready for the great struggle immediately upon the issue of the writs for a general election. Will each reader of these words—WILL YOU—without delay ascertain:

Whether the existing organization in your Polling District is efficient and active?

If it is so **assist in promoting** its frequent meeting to carry out the suggestions herewith published.

If there is no active working committee follow the suggestions given above for the assembling or formation of one.

Give your personal aid to the committee in:

1. The distribution of literature, arranging for local speakers and thoroughly studying each name on the voters' list with the view to polling every vote friendly to the Liberal cause.

2. The securing of copies of the **Dominion Voters' Lists** through your candidate.

3. Enlisting the co-operation of each organization in your Polling District working for the cause of Reform.

4. Inducing voters to make a careful study of Liberal principles—the platform and policy of the party.

5. Encouraging young and old to show by speaking and working their interest in the welfare of our country.

6. Insisting that the sub-committees meet frequently in their own immediate neighborhood, and that meetings of the Polling District committee be held at intervals for speech making and the presentation of reports privately at the conclusion of the public programme.

**Remember that a few more votes given to the Liberal candidate in each Polling District at the last Dominion general election would have defeated the Tory Government, put an end to the system of Protection and all the evils following in its train.**

John Bright, the great British Anti-Corn-Law Orator, gave the people the following advice: "Keep to reason, to the sense of justice, and the conscience of men, appeal to this great and, in the long run, unerring tribunal, and then your great and good cause is everything. Every blow you give tells; every speech you make, every article you print and every fact you bring forward, is a blow which your opponents can neither parry nor return, and thus you go on conquering and to conquer, and nothing can prevent it."

## THE LIBERAL POLICY.

During its term of office the Liberal Party strove to advance the interests of the country, and while in opposition with the same end in view—the general good—it has, by resolutions and debates in the House, together with addresses throughout the land, stoutly maintained its principles. The Liberal Party believing in freedom of trade, freedom of speech, and freedom of conscience, is progressive in its character. This was strongly exemplified by the National Liberal Convention held at Ottawa, June, 1893, when Liberals from every section of the Dominion assembled and without any previous arrangements proceeded at once to take counsel together upon the political situation. The results of their deliberations are embodied in a series of resolutions which contain a re-assertion of the line of policy marked out by the resolutions previously moved in the House and debated. These resolutions form a Platform upon which the Liberals in every Electoral District from the Atlantic to the Pacific stand. It is not sectional in its scope, it applies to the whole Dominion. The Convention is a tribute to the genius of the Liberal party. There was no division or lack of unity, but on the contrary, all who have given thought to and have discussed the different resolutions are united not only on the principles, but upon the details of the Policy of the party. Hon. Edward Blake, formerly the Dominion Liberal leader, now a member of the Imperial House of Commons, has written to Mr. A. Younie, then Secretary of the West Durham Reform Association, as follows: “May I be permitted to say how glad I am to think that the Reciprocity resolution of the late Reform Convention has ended the difference which led to the severance of my connection with the Riding, and that, though no longer to be associated with them as their representative, I am no longer to be divided from them in opinion.” The Platform is herewith printed in full and farther on each resolution is quoted and facts upon the principles contained are submitted. The issues of the hour are momentous and largely involve the future progress, prosperity, and even the honor of Canada. The Liberal platform adopted at the great National Convention contains principles that must be adopted to ensure honesty and economy in the public service, and to break down the trade restrictions and monopolies that are crushing the masses of our people.”



# LIBERAL PLATFORM

**RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE**

# National Liberal Convention

OTTAWA,

JUNE, 1893.

We, the Liberal Party of Canada, in convention assembled, declare:

## **1.—FREER TRADE—REDUCED TAXATION**

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it now is, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labors.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

## 2.—ENLARGED MARKETS—RECIPROCITY

That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the Empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;

That the period of the old reciprocity treaty was one of marked prosperity to the British North American colonies;

That the pretext under which the Government appealed to the country in 1891 respecting negotiation for a treaty with the United States was misleading and dishonest and intended to deceive the electorate;

That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that, on the contrary, it is manifest that the present Government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty;

That the first step towards obtaining the end in view, is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honorable to both countries;

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the Governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the Empire and the Republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

### 3.—PURITY OF ADMINISTRATION—CONDEMN CORRUPTION

That the Convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

The Government, which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys of which the people have been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrongdoing. We arraign the Government for retaining in office a Minister of the Crown proved to have accepted large contributions of money for election purposes from the funds of a railway company, which, while paying the political contributions to him, a member of the Government, with one hand, was receiving Government subsidies with the other.

The conduct of the Minister and the approval of his colleagues after the proof became known to them are calculated to degrade Canada in the estimation of the world, and deserve the severe condemnation of the people.

### 4.—DEMAND STRICTEST ECONOMY—DECREASED EXPENDITURE

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the Governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

### 5.—FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT—INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT

That the Convention regrets that, by the action of Ministers and their supporters in Parliament, in one case in which serious charges were made against a Minister of the Crown, investigation was altogether refused, while in another case the charges preferred were altered and then referred to a commission appointed upon the advice of the Ministry, contrary to the well settled practice of Parliament; and this Convention affirms:

That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against Ministers of the Crown, and the reference of such matters to royal commissions created upon the advice of the accused is at variance with the due responsibility of Ministers to the House of Commons, and tends to weaken the authority of the House over the Executive Government, and this Convention affirms that the powers of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fitting occasions be upheld.

### 6.—THE LAND FOR THE SETTLER—NOT FOR THE SPECULATOR

That in the opinion of this Convention the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

### 7.—OPPOSE THE DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT—FAVOR THE PROVINCIAL FRANCHISE

That the Franchise Act since its introduction has cost the Dominion Treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties;

That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million;



That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances, been prevented from exercising their natural rights;

That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction;

That it has produced gross abuses by partisan barristers appointed by the Government of the day;

That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many Provinces of the Dominion, and that in the opinion of this Convention the Act should be repealed, and we should revert to the Provincial Franchise.

#### **8.—AGAINST THE GERRYMANDER—COUNTY BOUNDARIES SHOULD BE PRESERVED**

That by the Gerrymander Acts, the electoral divisions for the return of members to the House of Commons have been "so made as to prevent a fair expression of the opinion of the country at the general elections, and to secure to the party now in power a strength out of all proportion greater than the number of electors supporting them would warrant. To put an end to this abuse, to make the House of Commons a fair exponent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that in the formation of electoral divisions, county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division.

#### **9.—THE SENATE DEFECTIVE—AMEND THE CONSTITUTION**

The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the Federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be amended so as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government.

#### **10.—QUESTION OF PROHIBITION—A DOMINION PLEBISCITE**

That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of Prohibition by means of a Dominion Plebiscite.

## I.—FREER TRADE—REDUCED TAXATION.

"That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not, as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

"That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

"It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

"It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

"It has checked immigration;

"It has caused great loss of population;

"It has impeded commerce;

"It has discriminated against Great Britain.

"In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

"That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

"That to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

"That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

"We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

"The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

"The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

"We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labors.

"This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada."

---

## PROMISES AND PERFORMANCE.

The authors of the National Policy, as anyone may see from their speeches during the election of 1878 and in the budget speeches of the Finance Ministers in subsequent years, made these promises, amongst others:

To abolish business depression.

To stop the exodus.

To turn the "balance of trade" in our favor.

To tax British goods in the bulk less than foreign.

To give the farmer a home market.

To develop our mineral wealth.

To obtain reciprocity with the United States.

To reduce the debt to \$100,000,000 by 1890.

To place a million people in the Northwest by 1891.

The last feat was to be accomplished only in part by the National Policy. "We have vast territories to fill up in the Northwest and British Columbia, that glorious land which Lord Dufferin lately visited and spoke so approvingly of. It is our duty to fill up these territories, to develop their wonderful resources, and we can best assist in doing so

by the adoption of a policy which will tend to improve the condition of the manufacturer and in the nature of things materially benefit all classes of the community."—Speech by Mr. Thomas White.

Instead of the N. P. benefiting the people who have gone into the territories and western provinces the loudest protests against it have come from them. The settlers, irrespective of party, have declared that it has been a burden without any compensating advantage whatsoever. Instead of immigration having been increased, resolutions of public meetings of farmers and townsfolk, agricultural organizations and boards of trade bear testimony that by making the settlers' lot harder the settlement of the country has been retarded. It is notorious that instead of a million persons in the Northwest there are only 250,000.

The reduction of the debt to \$100,000,000 was one of the promises in the budget speech of 1882. It was to be brought about by the immense receipts from Northwest lands.

Instead of reduction the net debt has risen from \$140,362,069 in 1878 to \$246,183,029, and the ordinary expenditure from \$23,503,158, which the Conservatives said was excessive, to \$37,585,025 in 1894.

The development of the mines was promised in Sir John Macdonald's resolutions of 1877 and 1878 and in the budget of 1879, but more particularly in the budget of 1887. In that year, when imposing heavy iron duties, Sir Charles Tupper looked with confidence to the erection of blast furnaces at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston, and also to the establishment "at an early day of industries for the manufacture of iron in the Northwest." Moreover "by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 to 100,000 souls, and affording the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity." Furthermore "this estimate of an increased population of 100,000 souls does not take into account the manufacture of castings and forgings, cutlery and edged tools, hardware, machinery and engines or steel rails. Were we to manufacture these articles now imported—and there is no reason why we should not steadily progress to that point—the population I have mentioned of 100,000 souls, would be no less than trebled."

In the year in which Sir Charles made the changes in the duties which were to bring about his prophecies, the production of pig iron in Canada was 40,000 tons. Last year, according to the iron men's own statement, the production was 50,000 tons. To achieve this result, the term for which the bounties were granted has been extended until 1899. Instead of any army of 20,000 men, there are, according to the iron men's statement, only one-twentieth of that number. There has been no mineral development to speak of, and the iron duties have confessedly failed.

The adverse balance of trade was cited by Sir Leonard Tilley in his budget speech of 1879 as one of the prime causes of hard times and he proposed to turn it the other way. But since 1879 the so-called balance of trade has been against us to the tune of \$200,000,000, as necessarily must happen to a borrowing country situated as this is.

### TRADE WITH BRITAIN.

As to the taxation of British goods, Sir Leonard in 1879 declared: "It may be said we shall receive from the imports from foreign countries a larger share of the \$20,000,000 we require than we shall receive from the mother country. I believe such will be the effect. But I think that in making such a statement to the House, belonging as we do to, and forming a part of that great country—a country that receives our natural products without any taxation, everything we have to send her—apart from our national feelings, I think this House will not object, if in the propositions before me the duties touch more heavily the imports from foreign countries than from our fatherland."

The fact is the reverse of what was promised. British goods in the bulk are taxed more severely than American. The duty levied upon the whole of the country's imports of British goods amounted in the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1893, to 22 per cent., while the duty levied upon the whole of the imports of American goods amounted to 13 1/4 per cent., a discrimination against England on the whole volume of trade of more than 8 per cent. A large amount of the importation from the United States was of goods that are imported free of duty for the benefit of manufacturers. Writing these off,



nine and a half millions of dollars was levied on thirty-two millions of dollars of imports from Britain, equivalent to 30 per cent.; and seven and three-fifths millions was levied in duty upon the twenty-eight and one-half millions of dollars imported from the United States, equivalent to 27 per cent. So there was 3 per cent. of a straight discrimination against our trade with Great Britain beyond that on the same quantity from the United States.

The discrimination has been so keen that it has had its effect upon trade. Trade is the exchange of commodities. Those to whom Canada sells her products have a right to expect Canada to purchase from them in return. But the exports of this country to Great Britain that year amounted to sixty-four millions, and the purchases from them amounted to forty-three millions. We exchanged with them forty-three millions of dollars worth of our goods, and took from them in cash twenty-one millions of dollars. How was it in our trade with the United States? We sold the United States less than forty millions of dollars worth, and purchased from them fifty-eight millions of dollars worth of goods. We exchanged the whole of the products we sold to the United States for commodities of their production and left with them more than eighteen millions of dollars in cash besides.

The policy of the Conservative party has also led to the scheduling of Canadian cattle in the British markets. This occasions an enormous loss to the people of this country.

In a recent paper on "Colonial and Foreign Commerce," Lord Farrer, the well-known economist, formerly Permanent Secretary of the Government Board of Trade, shows that in 1854 British imports from Canada constituted 4.6 per cent. of the total imports of Britain, whereas in 1890 they constituted about 3 per cent. In 1854 British exports to Canada were 6.2 per cent. of the whole, in 1890 only 2.7 per cent. He goes on to show that during the same period British imports from the United States have increased from 19.7 per cent. of the whole to 23.1 per cent., while the decline of British exports to the U.S., in proportion to the whole, has been less than the decline in British exports to Canada. They were 21.6 per cent. and are now 12.2 per cent. With regard to recent progress, British trade with Canada (including Newfoundland) has been almost at a standstill. In 1875 it amounted to £20,000,000; in 1892 to £23,000,000 an increase in 18 years of 15 per cent., whilst in the same period British trade with the United States grew from £95,000,000 to £150,000,000, an increase of nearly 60 per cent. Both Canada and the United States have just passed new tariff acts and there is little doubt that the Wilson Bill will do more for British trade with the United States than the Foster Act for Canadian trade with her.

What is likely to be the effect of this condition of affairs upon any British administrator that may have to interfere in our behalf in some vital dispute with the States to prevent us from doing something which will inflict serious injury upon Britain with the United States. It is perfectly true that man for man we do a larger trade with Britain than the Americans, but Lord Farrer says: "The real question for us (England), so far as the value of the trade is concerned, is not the amount of trade per man, but the aggregate amount of trade at the present moment, but the recent progress of trade as indicating its probable future." It may be said we can remove this danger to our future relations with the mother country by discriminating in her favor and against the United States. But even if we were willing to tax imports from the United States more heavily than imports from Britain, Britain might object to our doing so. At the present time, with an active tendency in the United States towards a revenue, she might not thank us for adopting a policy of discrimination. "Supposing," says Lord Farrer in another connection, "that the United States should retaliate and exclude the thirty (over forty in 1892) millions' worth of manufactured goods, and the many millions' worth of shipping service, which we send them, would the loss of that profit and employment make Canada and her people dearer to our manufacturers and our workmen?" Something should be done in view of the extreme likelihood that when the depression passes away American trade with Britain, vast as it now is, will increase at a constantly accelerated rate, still further eclipsing the increase in our trade and tending still further to diminish the interest the British democracy may have in taking our part against the States. We

have to consider, moreover, to what extent enlarged and continually widening commercial relations between Britain and the United States may affect the dealings of the British investor with Canada and the choice of the British emigrant. The question is a great one to all who are desirous of maintaining the value of the connection to Britain and its value to Canada.

### RECIPROCITY AND TALL CHIMNEYS.

That the N. P. would tend to secure reciprocity with the United States through reciprocity of tariffs was set forth in Sir John Macdonald's resolution of 1878 and elsewhere.

We have not got reciprocity. The false position into which the Government has put this country in connection with the sham negotiations which were entered into for the purpose of extricating themselves from the consequences of their misrepresentations prior to and during the general elections of 1891 are dealt with in another place in this pamphlet. It is sufficient to say that subsequent events have shown not only that in this promise the authors of the N. P. have failed, but also that they were opposed to accepting reciprocity when the opportunity presented itself.

The exodus was to be stopped and tall chimneys were promised, and an all-absorbing lucrative home market for the farmer. "Our workmen," Sir John Macdonald declared in one of his picnic speeches, "can be fully employed if we encourage our manufactures; they need not go over to the States to add strength and wealth to a foreign country and to deprive us of that strength and wealth." In his resolution of 1878 he said: "Such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home." The removal of depression, the inauguration of an era of prosperity, was another standard promise. Lord Lorne, a free trader, was made to say in the speech from the throne in 1879 that the N. P. would "aid in removing the commercial and financial depression which unhappily continues to exist." In 1882 the return of the Conservative party was asked in order to assure foreign investors, who were waiting to place their millions, that they might safely do so. In his budget speech that year Sir Leonard Tilley told the manufacturers to "clap on all sail," and looked for a boom period of indefinite duration.

None of these promises have been realized. Instead of a home market absorbing their surplus products at high prices the farmers export more than ever and prices were never so low. Here is a comparison of prices taken from the records of the Ontario Bureau of Industries. Not going back more than ten years it is shown that in this province prices had fallen per bushel as follows:

	1894.	1884.	Per cent.
Wheat.....	\$0 55	\$0 80	31
Barley.....	38	53	24
Oats.....	28	33	15
Rye.....	45	59	24
Peas.....	50	64	22
Hay per ton.....	7 50	9 50	
Potatoes.....	35	40	

As for the condition of trade in recent years and now, the least said the better. The policy which was to prevent such a thing as deficits has failed in that respect too, and a Tory Finance Minister has had a larger deficit than was known under the maligned Mackenzie administration. It is easy for a partizan speaker to indulge in the vague assertion that the N. P. has been a blessing, but when tried by the only satisfactory test, namely, a comparison of its performances with its promises, in detail, it turns out to have been a general all-round disappointment. The inference is plain that such progress as has been made since 1878 or 1879 has been made not by reason of it, but by reason of that natural growth and development which all new countries enjoy in a special degree. That it has brought certain infant industries into a cold world, and been of more or less benefit to some old ones need not be denied, but this has been done at the expense of other industries.

## THE EXODUS.

The census destroys any pretence that the exodus has been stopped. So far from fulfilling this promise the fact is the exodus during the ten years ending 1891 was more than double what it was between 1871 and 1881, and it was three times as much as the exodus which took place in Mr. Mackenzie's time. The total annual exodus during the Mackenzie regime according to the United States statistics was probably not more than 32,000 all told from 1874 to 1878; certainly it did not exceed 42,000 taking into account the entire foreign born immigration which came to Canada during that period. What has been the loss under the protective policy? If we may count the natural increase in Canada as great as in the United States, and the general rule is that families in this country are larger than over there, the natural increase of our population was 604,000 between 1881 and 1891. In addition, unless the Government's new immigration statistics have been a sham and a fraud, there were brought into Canada in the last census decade 886,000 immigrants. Add that number to the 604,000 of a natural increase and the total is 1,490,000. That is what the increase of our population should have been according to the Government's own blue books. Subtract from that the actual increase, which was 504,000, and there remain 986,000 souls missing. Where are they? All these who went away were probably not native-born Canadians. There may have been only 300,000 of them who belonged to our native-born population. But the total loss was 98,600 per annum during the ten years of the National Policy, as compared with an extreme estimate of 42,000 a year in Mr. Mackenzie's time.

In place of their natural increase New Brunswick only gained sixty-three souls in the decade ending 1891; Prince Edward Island one hundred and ninety, and Nova Scotia nine thousand nine hundred, while the total increase for the Maritime Provinces, with Ontario and Quebec, was about eight per cent. (including a considerable number of emigrants). This is scarcely more than half the increase which took place in those of the Southern States which suffered most severely from the civil war in the decade from 1860 to 1870. These gained fourteen per cent. in those ten years. It is considerably less than the increase in England and Wales in the ten years from 1881 to 1891, in spite of the fact that there was a large emigration from those countries. The rural population is decreasing. The practical effect of the protective policy is to attract industries and population from villages and towns to large centres. The whole of the increase, such as it is, has been in the towns, and at least two-thirds of it in the two cities of Toronto and Montreal and their suburbs. Immigration has cost two millions and been a failure. Our returns allege that we brought in 886,000 emigrants from 1881 to 1891 who declared their intention of settling in Canada. Our census shows that of these scarcely one hundred and fifty thousand remained. The United States census returns for 1890 shows that there were then about nine hundred and eighty thousand persons born in Canada then resident in the United States, and about one and a half millions of children born of Canadian parents. It is to be noted that of these nine hundred and eighty thousand, a very large proportion were men in the prime of life. Furthermore, facts have been recently laid before the House of Commons which prove that there are grounds for believing that gross frauds were committed by our census enumerators, especially in Nova Scotia, and many persons who had left Canada several years ago were returned as residents.

## WHAT HAVE THE FARMERS BENEFITED?

Protection is specially unjust to the farmers, miners and other producers of materials whose price is made in the foreign markets. The tariff cannot possibly secure to them better prices for what they sell—all it does is to make them pay more for what they have to buy. "It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property." According to the Bureau of Industries of Ontario in 1882, the value of farm property of the Province, exclusive of buildings, was \$632,000,000, and in 1892, \$615,000,000, a reduction of 2½ per cent. But during that ten years the number of farmers was increased from 201,000 in 1882 to 241,000. The additional 40,000 farmers added nothing to the value of the farm lands of the Province. In 1882 there were 19,000,000 acres occupied and in 1892, 21,000,000 acres, yet the 2,000,000 additional acres brought under cultivation added nothing to the value of the land in 1892. It costs about \$20 an acre to clear land and there were 1,750,000 acres cleared during the years between 1882 and 1892.



That amounts to \$35,000,000 added to the value on that account. As the land settled upon was worth at least \$10 an acre this is an additional value of \$20,000,000. Therefore, without counting the improvements made on farm lands in the way of drainage, reclaiming wet lands and in many other ways, there should have been, according to these figures, \$55,000,000 more value in 1892 than 1882. Therefore (leaving out improvements) the value of farm lands to-day is \$72,000,000 less than it would have been if the lands had maintained the value they had in 1882.

The value of the following field crops, wheat, oats, rye, peas, corn, buckwheat, beans, barley, potatoes, mangel-wurzels, carrots, turnips, hay, in 1891, was according to the Ontario Bureau of Industries reports, \$130,866,000, and in 1892, \$110,563,000, showing a decrease of \$20,303,000 in 1892.

### MANUFACTURERS' PROFITS AND FARMERS' PROFITS.

The question is asked sometimes, why are farm lands decreasing in value? They are decreasing for the same reason that other stocks decrease—because the profit, after the expense of working them is paid, is so small. Compare the returns from farm lands with the profits upon capital diverted by the protective policy into manufacturing industries. Remember that not only are the farm lands starved for want of money at a low rate of interest for their improvement, but in addition to being thus deprived of the use of the capital of the country, the farmers are obliged, by protection, to pay the high rate of profit upon the capital invested in the tariff-fed manufacturing industries. For this reason the following comparison of profits has great interest for the farmers and the great masses of our people whose welfare is bound up with that of the farmers.

According to the census of 1891 the manufacturers' condition in that year was as follows:

The capital invested amounted to .. . . .	\$353,837,000
Value of product .. . . .	475,446,000
Cost of raw material .. . . .	255,983,000
Cost of labor .. . . .	99,763,000
Number of hands .. . . .	367,000
<b>Amount of profit after deducting raw material .. . . .</b>	<b>219,643,000</b>
Amount of profit per hand employed .. . . .	596
Average wage paid each hand .. . . .	272
Net amount of profit, deducting material and wages, per hand .. . . .	324
<b>Manufacturers' profit on capital, 34 per cent.</b>	

Take the farmers' investment for the year 1892 according to the Ontario Bureau of Industries:

Capital invested .. . . .	\$979,979,000
Value of crop products .. . . .	\$110,563,000
Value of live stock sold or killed for sale .. . . .	32,454,000

Gross value of all products .. . . .	\$143,017,000
Less:	
Cost of seed .. . . .	\$ 12,050,000
Cost of feeding animals sold or killed for sale..	16,000,000
	<u>28,050,000</u>

Net proceeds of the farms .. . . .	114,967,000
------------------------------------	-------------

There are 241,000 farm holders in the Province. It would require the labor of another man on an average on each farm, which makes 483,400 hands. Dividing the net proceeds by this number of hands gives the sum of \$238, which is the amount made per hand on the farm that year. The average wage for farm hands was \$253 a year. The owner of the farm thus made out of his land \$15 less than the wages of the laborer he employed to assist him. **The manufacturer on the other hand made \$324 profit on every hand employed by him.**

### TAXES TAKEN BY MANUFACTURERS.

In considering the cost to the consumer of the National Policy, it has to be remembered that an immense amount of money is annually taken from the people by the manufacturers, besides the tax which goes into the public revenue. It is of the essence of a protective tariff that the manufacturers shall be enabled to collect from the consumers a larger sum than goes into the treasury. As a rule the home manufacturer will charge all he can without admitting the foreign article. This is made easier in a small market like Canada by the ease with which rings and combines can be formed. To illustrate:

Last year the duties were, say, \$20,000,000, in round figures. The wholesalers' and retail dealers' profits upon their increased outlay as a result of their having to pay the duty would be forty per cent., or a total of \$8,000,000. That was an incidental tax. Then, too, many political economists lay down the basis of calculation that for every \$3 of duty paid into the Government the farmer pays \$5 of incidental taxation to the domestic manufacturer. Upon that basis the incidental tax the consumer has paid to the domestic manufacturers in consequence of the existence of the duties upon the class of goods brought into the country which are manufactured in the country has amounted to \$34,000,000. So the gross amount besides the \$20,000,000 is: the merchants' profit upon the duty, which is practically a first cost, \$8,000,000, together with the incidental taxation or the enhanced cost of the domestic goods produced in this country, \$34,000,000. The sum of \$64,000,000 is thus extracted from the pockets of the consumers, of which only \$20,000,000 goes into the revenue of the country. This may not be mathematically correct; it is an approximate calculation. It is probably well within the mark. Whatever the exact figures the sum is enormous and the farmer is bled in the manner illustrated by these figures.

### WHERE THE REVENUE RECEIVES NO BENEFIT.

Moreover there are many cases in which the tariff is actually or virtually prohibitive, and in these instances the public is often very heavily taxed while the revenue receives no benefit whatever. For example, Canada consumes about three hundred million pounds of sugar. This is taxed about two dollars per barrel of three hundred pounds. The people have, on an average, of years, to pay some two million dollars a year and scarcely anything is paid into the treasury.

So similarly in rice: We consume about twenty-five million pounds. The tax costs the people over three hundred thousand dollars and the amount paid into the treasury was about ninety thousand dollars, one-half of which was collected on a small quantity of cleaned rice.

The same is the case with certain kinds of iron and wire, with many sorts of the coarser kinds of cottons and woollens, with the cheaper wall papers and generally with all the commoner kinds of articles going largely into general consumption on which heavy specific duties are now levied.

It is well known that as to many articles (especially those made of iron and other metals) the finished product of one manufacturer is the raw material of another. Such articles very often pass through five or six different hands before reaching the consumer. Each of these men must and will charge his trade profits and expenses on the cost of the article to him. It often happens in this way that a tax of 30 to 35 per cent. in the first instance will involve a tax of 50, 60 or 70 per cent. to the final purchaser. This applies in some degree to all customs tariffs and is a very strong argument against a high rate of tariff even for purely revenue purposes.

Assuming that we now pay sixty millions of taxes a year, it follows that as there are scarcely one million families in Canada, every family, on the average, has to pay about sixty dollars a year.

### BRITAIN'S CUSTOMS TARIFF.

In England the total revenue from the customs is about one hundred millions, raised from eight millions of families, who pay at the outside an average of a little over twelve

dollars per family. The remainder of the revenue is raised by an income tax, falling chiefly on the wealthier part of the community, and by excise, which is to some extent a voluntary payment. In point of fact the amount of customs duties necessarily paid by a British wage-earner may fairly be put at a much lower figure than twelve dollars per family, as a very large part of the customs duties are derived from taxes on luxuries which he does not consume at all, and about one-half (fifty millions or thereabouts) arises from the duty on tobacco, which he may or may not use, at his own pleasure. In the case of the Canadian there is no escape. All he can do is to choose whether he will pay his tax into the treasury or into the pocket of the protected manufacturer. The British customs tariff yields a total revenue of about £20,000,000, as follows:

On foreign spirits . . . . .	£ 4,290,000
Wine . . . . .	1,268,000
Tobacco . . . . .	10,124,000
Tea, cocoa, coffee and chicory . . . . .	3,745,000
Dried fruits . . . . .	345,000
Miscellaneous . . . . .	33,000
Total . . . . .	£19,805,000

The English excise laws are so arranged on spirits, wines and tobaccos that the home producer has absolutely no protection. As the British customs law stands therefore £20,000,000 is collected without there being a vestige of protection in the tariff.

#### SPECIFIC DUTIES.

Among the many promises of the tariff revision (in 1894) was the total or partial abolition of specific duties. These duties, levied on the pound, the yard, the bushel, or the dozen, are unfairly heavy on consumers of cheaper grades of goods. To tax a yard of cheap cloth the same amount as a yard of cloth of superior quality is a manifest injustice to consumers of coarser lines. This injustice pertains to all specific duties, and as in other objectionable features of the Canadian tariff, the revision has left matters little or no better than before. The injustice is in proportion to the fluctuation and range of prices. As an instance, the tax of two cents per lb. on raspberries, cherries, strawberries, etc., is trifling when such small fruit are expensive luxuries. But, when the price falls and they become articles of common use, it may be as high as 50 per cent. The Government has a two-fold object in retaining this class of duties. They lessen the burden on wealthy consumers, who are able most effectually to oppose the protective system, and they keep the public in ignorance of the extent to which they are taxed. An innocent-looking tax of a few cents per pound or per yard may, and does, conceal duties of more than 100 per cent. The following list shows some of the unjust discriminations effected by specific duties in the new Canadian tariff. It does not contain all the discriminations, and the widest variations have not been presented:

Rate of duty	Upon an assumed cost of	Rate per cent. of duty
Collars, per doz....24c per doz. and 25 per cent.....	\$0 72	58 1-3
Collars, per doz....24c per doz. and 25 per cent.....	1 44	41 2-3
Cuffs, per doz. pairs....4c per pair and 25 per cent....	96	75
Cuffs, per doz....4c per pair and 25 per cent.....	1 92	50
Shirts, per doz....\$1 per doz. and 25 per cent.....	4 00	50
Shirts, per doz....\$1 per doz. and 25 per cent.....	20 00	30
Blankets, per lb....5c per lb. and 25 per cent.....	40	37½
Blankets, per lb....5c per lb. and 25 per cent.....	65	33
Oilecloth, per yard } 30 per cent. but not less than 4c {	8	50
Oilecloth, per yard } per square yard..... {	75	30
Wall paper, borders, per roll. } 1½c per roll and 25 {	9	41 2-3
Wall paper, borders, per roll. } per cent..... {	75	27
Tweeds, per yard .....	25	65
Tweeds, per yard .....	2 00	30
Coatings, per yard .....	1 00	35
Coatings, per yard .....	6 00	26 2-3



	Rate of duty.	Upon an assumed cost of.	Rate per cent. of duty.
Overcoatings, per yard .....		50	65
Overcoatings, per yard .....		7 00	28
Castile soap, per lb....2c per lb.....		12	16 2-3
Castile soap, per lb....2c per lb.....		20	10
Canned fish, per lb....1½c per can or package.....		10	15
Canned fish, per lb.....		20	7½
(This duty is levied on the can.)			
Books....6c per lb.....	cheap		100
Books....6c per lb.....	dear		1
Soap, common, per lb....1c per lb.....		5	20
Soap, common, per lb....1c per lb.....		10	10
Clothes wringers, each....25c each and 20 per cent.	4 00		26¼
Clothes wringers, each....25c each and 20 per cent.	10 00		22½
Ready-made clothing, per suit .....	8 00		42
Ready-made clothing, per suit .....	30 00		33
Socks and stockings, per doz. pair. } 10c. per doz. and {	60		51 2-3
Socks and stockings, per doz. pair.. } 35 per cent. {	10 00		36
Dessicated cocoa, per lb....5c per pound.....		12	41 2-3
Dessicated cocoa, per lb....1¼c per lb.....		15	33 1-3
Rice, per lb....1¼c per lb.....		5	25
Rice, per lb....1¼c per lb.....		10	12½
Raisins, per lb....1c per lb.....		5	20
Raisins, per lb....1c per lb.....		12½	8
Prunes, per lb....1c per lb.....		4	25
Prunes, per lb....1c per lb.....		15	6 2-3
Currants, dried, per lb....1c per lb.....		6	16 2-3
Currants, dried, per lb....1c per lb.....		10	10
Vinegar, per gal....15c per gal.....		15	100
Vinegar, per gal....15c per gal.....		30	50
Corn starch, farina, etc....1½c per lb.....		10	15
Corn starch, farina, etc....1½c per lb.....		18	8 1-3
Coal oil....6c per gal.....		from 60	to 100
Carpets, cotton warp, per yard....3c per yd. and 25 p.c.		20	40
Carpets, cotton warp, per yard.....		50	31
Carpets, all wool, per yard....5c per sq. yd. and 25 p.c.		50	35
Carpets, all wool, per yard....5c per sq. yd. and 25 p.c.	1 00		30
Cordage, per lb....1¼c per lb. and 10 per cent.....		10	22½
Cordage, per lb....1¼c per lb. and 10 per cent.....		20	16¼
Window shades, per yard. } 35 per cent. but not less {	10		50
Window shades, per yard. } . than 5c per sq. yard {	20		35
Baking powder, per lb....6c per lb.....		30	20
Baking powder, per lb....6c per lb.....		60	10

On tweeds, etc., where the duty is not stated above, the tariff taxes the goods per pound weight, thus manifestly pressing more heavily upon the coarser and heavier goods.

#### EXTRACTS FROM THE TARIFF.

Following are the duties imposed by the tariff upon some of the articles in common use:

Adzes and hatchets .. . . .	35 per cent.
Agate iron-ware .. . . .	35 "
Agricultural implements: Mowing machines, self-binding har- vesters, harvesters without binders, binding attachments, reapers, sulky and walking ploughs, harrows, cultivators, seed drill and horse rakes .. . . .	20 "
Agricultural implements: Axes of all kinds, scythes, hay knives, lawn mowers, pronged forks, rakes, hoes and other agricul- tural tools or implements .. . . .	35 "

Agricultural implements: Shovels, spades, 50 cents per doz. and	25	per cent.
Axle grease . . . . .	25	"
Bags or sacks of hemp, linen or jute, and cotton seamless bags . .	20	"
Bags, cotton, made by the needle . . . . .	32½	"
Bags, paper, printed or plain . . . . .	25	"
Baking powder . . . . .	6c.	per lb.
Barbed wire fencing of iron or steel . . . . .	¾ c.	"
Binder twine . . . . .	12½	per c'nt.
Blankets . . . . . 5c. per lb. and	25	"
Blueing (laundry) . . . . .	25	"
Bolts, nuts and washers (iron or steel) . . . . . 1c per lb. and	20	"
Bolts, nuts and washers, iron or steel less than ¾-inch in dia- meter) . . . . . 1c. per lb. and 25 per cent., but not less than	35	"
Boots and shoes (leather) . . . . .	25	"
Braces or suspenders . . . . .	35	"
Braids . . . . .	30	"
Brass nails, rivets, screws, etc. . . . .	30	"
Brushes . . . . .	25	"
Buckles, iron or steel . . . . .	27½	"
Buckles, brass . . . . .	30	"
Builders' hardware . . . . .	32½	"
Buttons, pantaloons, etc. . . . .	20	"
Candles, paraffin wax . . . . .	4c.	per lb.
Candles (other than above) . . . . .	25	per cent.
Candy and confectionery . . . . .	35	"
Caps and hats, fur . . . . .	25	"
Caps and hats and bonnets . . . . .	30	"
Carpenters' rules . . . . .	35	"
Carpets (two-ply and three-ply ingrain, whose warp is wholly composed of cotton, or other material than wool, worsted, hair of alpaca goat or other like animals). 3c per sq. yd. and	25	"
Carpets (treble ingrain, three-ply or two-ply carpets composed wholly of wool) . . . . . 5 cents per square yard and	25	"
Carpets (other than above) . . . . .	30	"
Carriages, buggies, pleasure carts and similar vehicles (not elsewhere specified)—costing not more than \$50, \$5 each and 25 per cent.; costing more than \$50 . . . . .	35	"
Carriages: Farm and freight wagons, carts, drays and similar vehicles . . . . .	25	"
Chains, trace, tug and halter . . . . .	32½	"
Chimneys, lamp, glass . . . . .	30	"
Chinaware and porcelain ware . . . . .	30	"
Churns, wood . . . . .	20	"
Crocks and churns, earthenware, 3c per gal. of holding capacity.		
Clothes wringers . . . . . 25c each and	20	"
Collars, cotton, linen, etc. . . . . 24c per doz. and	25	"
Cuffs, cotton, linen, etc. . . . . 4c per pair and	25	"
Cultivators . . . . .	20	"
Currycombs and currycards . . . . .	32½	"
Cutlery, table, not plated . . . . .	32½	"
Cutlery, table, plated . . . . .	35	"
Cutlery, N. O. P., not plated . . . . .	25	"
Cutters and sleighs . . . . .	30	"
Duck, cotton, printed, dyed or colored . . . . .	30	"
Earthenware and stoveware, jugs, crocks, etc., 3c per gal. capa- city.		
Earthenware, viz., drain pipes and tiles . . . . .	35	"
Earthenware, drain tiles not glazed . . . . .	20	"
Edge tools, u.s.s. . . . .	35	"
Envelopes, printed or not . . . . .	30	"

Fanning mills and parts .....	35	per cent.
Barbed wire fencing of iron or steel .....	$\frac{3}{4}$ c.	per lb.
Buckthorn and strip fencing of iron or steel .....	$\frac{1}{2}$ c.	"
Fertilizers, compounded or manufactured .....	10	per cent.
Flags, bunting or cotton .....	30	"
Forks, pronged, hay, manure, etc. ....	35	"
Furniture, all kinds .....	30	"
Glass goods, lamp chimneys, etc. ....	30	"
Mirrors .....	27½ to 32½	"
Axle grease .....	25	"
Grindstones .....	30	"
Halter chains .....	32½	"
Hammers .....	25	"
Harrows and parts .....	20	"
Hats, caps and bonnets, not fur .....	30	"
Hay knives .....	35	"
Hay rakes, wood .....	35	"
India rubber and waterproof clothing ..	35	"
Linen clothing .....	32½	"
Mangles, washing .....	27½	"
Harvest mitts and mitts and gloves of all kinds ..	35	"
Nails and spikes .....	30	"
Wire nails .....	1c.	per lb.
Cut nails .....	$\frac{3}{4}$ c.	"
Coal oil .....	6c.	per gal.
Ploughs, walking and sulky .....	20	per cent.
Horse rakes .....	20	"
Rakes, not elsewhere specified .....	35	"
Rice, cleaned .....	1¼c.	per lb.
Saws of all kinds .....	32½	per cent.
Screw nails .....	35	"
Scythes .....	35	"
Scythe stones .....	30	"
Separators and parts .....	30	"
Shears (pruning and sheep) .....	35	"
Shovels and spades .....	25	"
Sleighs and sleds .....	30	"
Soap (common) .....	1c.	per lb.
Soap (castile, mottled or white) .....	2c.	"
Starch .....	1½c.	"
Steam engines (portable) .....	30	per cent.
Stoves .....	27½	"
Stove pipes .....	27½	"
Stove shovels .....	27½	"
Sugar (raw above 16 Dutch standard and all refined) ..	64c	per 100 lbs.
Syrup .....	$\frac{1}{2}$ c.	per lb.
Molasses .....	1½c.	"
Surcingle (cotton or hemp) .....	30	per cent.
Suspenders and braces .....	35	"
Underwear, of all kinds .....	30 to 35	"
Washing machines .....	27½	"
Winceys, checkered, striped or fancy cotton ..	30	"
Windmills .....	30	"

"The customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service; and it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States."



## 2.—Enlarged Markets—Reciprocity.

"That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

"That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the Empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;

"That the period of the old reciprocity treaty was one of marked prosperity to the British North American colonies;

"That the pretext under which the Government appealed to the country in 1891 respecting negotiation for a treaty with the United States was misleading and dishonest and intended to deceive the electorate;

"That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that, on the contrary, it is manifest that the present Government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty;

"That the first step towards obtaining the end in view, is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honorable to both countries;

"That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the Governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the Empire and the Republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

"That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government, without whose approval no treaty can be made."

---

### THE BENEFITS OF RECIPROCITY

Reciprocity is not a mere theory as regards the effect to be produced. The old reciprocity treaty extending from 1854 to 1866 affords practical illustration of the benefits to be derived from interchange of trade with the United States. During the twelve years that that treaty remained in operation our exports to the United States nearly quadrupled; rising from \$10,473,000 in 1854 to \$39,950,000 in 1866 from all the provinces now embraced within the bounds of the Dominion. The period during which the treaty remained in force was one of marked prosperity for all the provinces. Since the abrogation of the treaty in 1866 our export trade with the United States has practically remained stationary though maintaining the average annual increase from 1854 to 1866 would have carried it up for 1893 to over \$100,000,000; the actual amount having been for that year \$37,296,110 of the produce of Canada, not including coin and bullion, the produce of Canada, which amounted to an additional \$309,459.

### SHAM NEGOTIATIONS.

It is obvious that the advantages to be derived from reciprocity are very great and it is to be regretted that the Government has been guilty of duplicity in dealing with the question. When Parliament was dissolved in February, 1891, the reason assigned for the act was that a treaty of reciprocity with the United States was about to be made and that it would be desirable to refer the treaty to a Parliament fresh from the people, and not to a moribund House. Statements in Government organs that a reciprocity treaty in

natural products similar to the treaty of 1854 was being negotiated at Washington and that Sir Charles Tupper was going there as Canadian Commissioner, attracted attention in the United States, and on January 29th, 1891, Congressman Baker addressed a letter to Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, asking if these rumors were well founded. To this inquiry Mr. Blaine made the following unequivocal reply:

WASHINGTON, D.C., 29th January, 1891.

My Dear Mr. Baker.—I authorize you to contradict the rumors you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured that no scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion confined to natural products will be entertained by this Government. I know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper's coming to Washington.

Very truly yours,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

Five days after this letter had emphatically given the lie to the claim that reciprocity negotiations were in progress Parliament was dissolved on the pretext above named. And the false representations thus made to the electors no doubt aided powerfully in securing a verdict favorable to the Government.

Having won the election on these representations it became necessary to fulfill the promise to send commissioners to Washington, and this was done in April, 1891. Owing to indignation at the duplicity and misrepresentations of the Canadian authorities as to the action of the United States Government in the premises, President Harrison refused the Canadian commissioners an interview.

In February, 1892, Canadian commissioners succeeded through the intervention of Sir Julien Pauncefote in obtaining a reception by Hon. James G. Blaine, American Secretary of State, and then stated their proposal for reciprocity to be on the basis of the treaty of 1854 and to be confined to natural products. To this proposal Mr. Blaine made answer that the United States would consider no proposition for reciprocity which did not embrace an agreed list of manufactures, as was well known to the Canadian commissioners from all previous declarations of the American State Department. In truth the Canadian proposals were a mockery made solely to save appearances.

American duties have been imposed upon Canadian agricultural products imported into the United States since 1866. In October, 1890, these duties were largely increased by the McKinley Bill and the disastrous effect upon our export trade produced by this increase is shown by a comparison of farm exports for the year ending June 30th, 1890, the last year before the McKinley Bill went into operation, and the year ending June 30th, 1893, the last year for which we have full trade returns since the bill went into operation. The following is the comparison in twelve leading articles of farm products:

#### COMPARISON OF EXPORT OF FARM PRODUCTS 1890—1893.

Name of articles.	1890.	1893.
Horses . . . . .	\$1,887,895	\$1,123,339
Cattle . . . . .	104,623	11,032
Poultry . . . . .	105,612	52,114
Eggs . . . . .	1,793,104	324,355
Wool . . . . .	235,436	228,030
Flax . . . . .	175,563	124,082
Barley . . . . .	4,582,562	638,271
Split peas . . . . .	74,215	4,214
Hay . . . . .	922,797	854,958
Malt . . . . .	149,310	19
Potatoes . . . . .	308,915	259,176
Rye . . . . .	113,320	3,302
	<hr/> \$10,453,352	<hr/> \$3,624,892

## UNITED STATES MARKET COMPARED WITH ALL OTHERS.

It is the custom of the Conservative orators, and of the Conservative press to seek to belittle the importance of the American market, and we are told that substitutes for that market can easily be obtained, as for instance in Australia, a country which last year took of the farm products of Canada to the value of \$25 only. A statement of the lines in which our exports to the United States, even under the grievous restrictions of the McKinley Bill. exceeded our exports to all the rest of the world in 1893 will show how utterly destitute of foundation is this assertion. Here is the table which is more convincing than argument:

Articles or classification of exports the produce of Canada.	United States.	All other countries.
Products of the mine.... .	\$ 4,756,280	\$ 573,610
“ forest.... .	13,859,960	12,499,950
Fresh water fish and salt water		
fish, fresh .... .	1,287,822	4,642
Horses.... .	1,123,339	337,818
Swine . . . . .	130,093	15,997
Sheep.... .	1,088,814	159,041
Poultry.... .	52,144	9,013
Bones .... .	58,444	10,282
Hides..... .	385,246	7,122
Sheep pelts.. . . .	66,939	16
Wool .... .	288,030	281
Flax.. . . .	124,082	... .
Berries.... .	96,104	115
Fruit, N.E.S.... .	24,646	1,114
Barley .... .	638,271	306,084
Beans.... .	351,058	4,624
Hay..... .	854,958	597,914
Straw .... .	25,117	932
Maple sugar.... .	48,174	1,477
Trees, shrubs and plants.... .	11,969	232
Potatoes.... .	259,176	162,782
Vegetables .... .	105,836	10,404
Other articles . . . . .	27,096	1,577
Fertilizers.. . . .	7,706	... .
Furs.... .	6,664	2,103
Grindstones.... .	24,754	948
Gypsum.... .	27,091	2,366
Household effects.. . . .	1,246,085	37,081
Lime.... .	97,898	8,207
Barrels .... .	10,631	6,297
Household furniture.... .	123,872	50,749
Wood pulp.... .	424,253	1,640
Other manufactures.. . . .	249,752	117,727
Bullion .... .	309,459	... .
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$28,132,223	\$14,932,145



# THE WILSON BILL AGRICULTURAL SCHEDULE.

Even under the modified provisions of the agricultural schedule of the Wilson Bill Canadian farm products entering the United States are still subject to burdensome duties, the price received by the Canadian producer being diminished to the extent of such duty. The duties on agricultural products, provided by the Wilson Bill are as follows:

Horses .. . . .	20 per cent.
Cattle .. . . .	20 "
Sheep .. . . .	20 "
Poultry, alive .. . . .	2c. per lb.
Poultry, dressed .. . . .	3c. "
Fresh meats .. . . .	20 per cent.
Butter .. . . .	4c. per lb.
Cheese .. . . .	4c. "
Rye .. . . .	20 per cent.
Wheat .. . . .	20 "
Oats .. . . .	20 "
Buckwheat .. . . .	20 "
Rye and wheat flour .. . . .	20 "
Oatmeal .. . . .	15 "
Barley .. . . .	30 "
Malt .. . . .	40 "
Beans .. . . .	20 "
Onions .. . . .	20c. per bushel.
Peas .. . . .	20c. "
Split peas .. . . .	50c. "
Apples .. . . .	20 per cent.
Potatoes .. . . .	15c. per bushel.
Eggs .. . . .	3c. per dozen.
Honey .. . . .	10c. per gallon.
Hops .. . . .	8c. per lb.
Hay .. . . .	\$2 per ton.
Straw .. . . .	15 per cent.

Canadian cattle are now subjected to quarantine in retaliation for the Canadian quarantine of American cattle, and the result is that our cattle are practically excluded from the American market.

If the people of Canada desire to obtain reciprocity of trade with the United States on fair and equitable terms the task must be entrusted to a ministry favorable to such an arrangement, and a change of Government will be necessary. With a Liberal Government at Ottawa there is little doubt that such a treaty can be speedily consummated.

### 3.—Purity of Administration.— Condemn Corruption.

"That the convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for yearspast has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of enquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

"The Government, which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys whereof the people have been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrongdoing. We arraign the Government for retaining in office a Minister of the Crown proved to have accepted very large contributions of money for election purposes from the funds of a railway company, which, while paying the political contributions to him, a member of the Government, with one hand, was receiving Government subsidies with the other.

"The conduct of the minister and the approval of his colleagues after the proof became known to them are calculated to degrade Canada in the estimation of the world and deserve the severe condemnation of the people."

---

#### A FEW EXAMPLES.

The force of the charges of corruption made against the Conservative Government, and the urgent condemnation they deserve, can be best shown by a few examples.

The illustrations given are confined to cases involving the action of members of the present administration, or of their supporters in the House, who have been sustained in their wrongdoing by the ministry and the party in Parliament.

1. In the Caron Case the evidence is complete of the levying by a Minister for a reptile fund of an enormous sum from those interested in railway government subsidies, and its expenditure by Ministers in electoral corruption. The exposure is more remarkable because the original charges were mutilated and enquiry largely suided, on the motion of Mr. Bowell, the present First Minister.

2. The McGreevy Conspiracy illustrates the levying of corruption funds from contractors for public works, the complicity of Ministers, and the tampering with justice by the release of political criminals.

3. The Blind Share Case illustrates the encouragement and assistance given by Mr. Bowell, the new Premier, to the trafficking in Orders-in-Council.

4. The Cochrane Case is a gross case of the sale of public offices by a member of Parliament.

5. The Turcotte Case is one where a Member of Parliament is maintained in his seat while drawing the profits from a Government contract.

#### THE CARON CASE.

Sir Adolphe P. Caron, M. P., is the leader of the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec, and he ranks next to the Premier in the Cabinet, both in seniority of appointment and in influence.

In 1892, charges were made by Mr. J. D. Edgar, M. P., in the House of Commons that sums amounting to \$100,000 and upwards were levied from Government contractors and those interested in certain railway subsidies, and were spent in the bribery of twenty-two constituents in the District of Quebec, at the general election of 1887.

To investigate these charges, he demanded a reference to the Committee of Privileges and Elections. The members composing this committee are, in the proportion of two to one, supporters of the Government.

The Ministers did not dare to face a full enquiry, and therefore they put up Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, the present Premier, to move to strike out some, and to vary others of the charges.

The Tarte-McGreevy inquiry of the previous year was made before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and it had been so damaging to the Government that they dare not again face the committee. Mr. Bowell therefore, provided in his motion that the emasculated charges should be referred to a Royal Commission, to be appointed by the Government themselves and selected by the accused. Mr. Bowell's motion was carried by the usual party majority.

Mr. Edgar very properly declined to appear at the sittings of this Royal Commission but sent to the Commissioners a list of his witnesses, whom they called and partially examined.

In due time the Royal Commission reported the evidence taken. The startling and disgraceful facts revealed before them, even under the limited scope of the inquiry, show that the Ministers had good reasons for dreading the more complete exposure that would have been made if the original charges had been gone into.

It was clearly shown that when Sir Adolphe Caron entered the Ministry in 1880, he was a shareholder of the construction company who received all the Government subsidies granted to the Quebec & Lake St. John Railway Company. After he entered the Government, the subsidies voted to that railway exceeded a million of dollars. The late Senator Ross was president of this company, and Mr. Beemer was the contractor, also deeply interested in the subsidies. Just before the elections of 1887, Sir Adolphe Caron applied for a political subscription from Senator Ross, who promptly gave him \$25,000.

According to Mr. Beemer's books, there were also about the same time a number of other payments amounting to \$25,000 more, which were charged to "A. P. C." and "G. E. F." These letters were sworn to have meant "A. P. Caron" and "General Election Fund." There can be no doubt that at least \$50,000 was furnished towards a corruption fund in 1887, from those interested in the subsidies to this one railway. It was a good investment for them, of course, to make this contribution, for the Government have paid them \$463,408 since 1887.

Then there was the Temiscouata Railway, which was also receiving Dominion subsidies, and was partially enquired into by the Royal Commissioners. They found in this instance, too, that \$25,000 was set apart and expended by this railway for political purposes during the progress of the work of construction.

These sums went to swell a Reptile Fund for the District of Quebec alone, for the elections of 1887, which amounted to \$112,000 according to the figures of the McGreevy papers published in The Globe.

Out of the twenty-two counties where this fund was expended, the Government only carried ten seats, making the average cost to the country for each member returned to support them \$11,200.

It is not at all unfair to assume that in the rest of the Dominion similar corruption funds have been provided by the same vile means for the elections of 1887, and for all elections.

The raising of these enormous funds before every general election is a well recognized practice of the Conservative party in Canada. Before another Royal Commission in 1873, it was proved that Sir Hugh Allen paid for the promise of the old Canadian Pacific Railway Charter, \$365,000 to the election fund of the Conservative party in 1872. How much more they had from other sources for that election will never be known.

For each dollar that a contractor, or a subsidized railway company, or a tariff-protected monopolist, pays to reptile funds, he is in a position to demand a ten-fold return in the plunder of the public. By the acceptance of these bribes, the Government place themselves at the mercy of the contributors.

Since the exposures in the Caron Case, several new Ministries have been constructed, and in each one of them Sir Adolphe Caron has been placed in a high and honorable position. His offence has been adopted by the Conservative party as their own, and he himself has boldly justified it in his place on the floor of Parliament in these memorable words: "I say that under the same circumstances what I did on that occasion I would do again to-morrow in order to help my friends."



The Conservative members of the House of Commons cannot shirk their share of responsibility in this matter, because on two occasions they voted down motions of censure that were moved by Mr. Edgar. One vote took place on the 23rd of March, 1893, and the other on the 3rd of July, 1894. On one or both of these occasions the following members voted approving of Sir Adolphe Caron's conduct:

Amyot, Bain (Soulanges), Baird, Baker, Barnard, Belley, Bennet, Bergeron, Bergin, Blanchard, Boyd, Boyle, Bryson, Burnham, Cameron, Cargill, Carignan, Carling, Carpenter, Carscallen, Chesley, Cleveland, Coatsworth, Cochrane, Cockburn, Corbould, Corby, Costigan, Craig, Curran, Daly, Davin, Davis, Dennison, Desaulniers, Dickey, Dugas, Dupont, Dyer, Earle, Fairburn, Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville), Ferguson (Renfrew), Foster, Fréchette, Gillies, Girouard (Two Mountains), Grandbois, Grant, Guillet, Haggart, Haslam, Hasen, Henderson, Hodgins, Hughes, Hutchins, Ingram, Ives, Jeannotte, Joncas, Kaulbach, Kenny, Lachapelle, Langevin (Sir Hector), LaRiviere, Leclair, Lepine, Lippe, Macdonald (King's), Macdonald (Winnipeg), Macdonald (Algoma), Macdowal, Mackintosh, McAllister, McDonald (Assiniboia), McDonald (Victoria), McDougald (Pictou), McDougall (Cape Breton), McInerney, McKay, McLean (King's), McLennan, McLeod, Madill, McNeill, Mara, Marshall, Masson, Metcalfe, Miller, Mills (Annapolis), Moneriff, Montague, Northrup, Ouimet, Patterson (Colechester), Patterson (Huron), Pelletier, Pridham, Prior, Pope, Putnam, Reid, Robillard, Roome, Rosamond, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Lisgar), Ryckman, Simard, Smith (Ontario), Sproule, Stairs, Stevenson, Taylor, Temple, Thompson, Tisdale, Tupper, Turcotte, Tyrwhitt, Wallace, White (Cardwell), White (Shelburne), Weldon, Wilmot, Wilson, Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland).

#### THE MCGREEVY CONSPIRACY AND THE LANGEVIN-CARON REPTILE FUND

In 1891, a number of charges were made in Parliament by Mr. Tarte, M. P., against Sir Hector Langevin, then Minister of Public Works, and Hon. T. McGreevy, M. P. Mr. Tarte alleged that the contracting firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., were allowed by Sir Hector Langevin, then Minister of Public Works, with the assistance of Mr. McGreevy, to cheat the country out of hundreds of thousands of dollars on Government contracts.

These charges were referred to a Committee of the House for investigation, and the public were startled by the revelations of fraud and conspiracy by which the country was shown to have been robbed of about half a million of dollars. The full extent to which this money was applied to Tory Corruption Funds will never be known, but evidence was dragged out of unwilling witnesses that \$119,438 of it was paid for election expenses.

The famous Quebec District Election Fund of 1887 received \$20,000 from these contractors, and that fund was distributed for election purposes by two Ministers of the Crown, Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe P. Caron.

As an instance of the grossly corrupt uses that were made of this Reptile Fund, the case of Three Rivers, Sir Hector Langevin's own constituency, may be given. In 1887 the total number of votes cast for Sir Hector, the successful candidate, was 640. The sum returned by Sir Hector's agent and published as his total lawful election expenses was \$917.09. The sum sent into the constituency from this fund alone was \$13,150. No wonder he was successful by an expenditure of over \$20 for every vote he received.

Messrs. McGreevy and Connolly were placed on trial for their part in this conspiracy to defraud, and on conviction in November, 1893, were sentenced to gaol for twelve months. How could a Conservative Government who owed their places to the support given them by these conspirators permit them to serve out their sentence? How could Sir Adolphe Caron, a noble knight and a Minister, who had received and expended in corruption, part of the proceeds of this conspiracy, allow his friends and pals to languish in prison while he was an adviser of the Crown? It was therefore represented to the Government that confinement did not agree with the prisoners' digestion, and they were liberated after but three months' imprisonment.

The eminent judge who tried the case (Mr. Justice Rose) said that the offence was only aggravated by the purposes of electoral corruption to which the proceeds of this conspiracy were applied; yet it was the very baseness of the objects of the

conspiracy that saved these culprits from the punishment of their crimes. To screen the criminal purveyors of the Reptile Fund the course of justice was tampered with and the prison doors were flung open wide for the escape of the men who had dark political secrets in their breasts, which they threatened to divulge.

In order that the full responsibility may be shown to rest upon the proper shoulders the following extract is given from the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons of 3rd July, 1894. It is a motion of want of confidence, and all the Government supporters in the House voted against it:

"The Order of the Day for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, "being read:

"Sir John Thompson moved, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

"Mr. Edgar moved in amendment thereto, that all the words after the word "that" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: 'from the public trial and conviction of Thomas McGreevy and N. K. Connolly for conspiracy to defraud. "and from evidence and papers already before this House, it appears that large portions of the moneys which were found, upon said trial, to have been criminally received by the said Thomas McGreevy from Government contractors, were so received "by him for the purpose of being expended in elections in the interest of the Conservative party, and for distribution by Sir Hector Langevin, M.P., and Sir Adolphe Caron, M.P., for the election of themselves and of other supporters of the Government at the general elections held in February, 1887.'

"That it further appears that large portions of the said moneys, together with "other large sums collected by Sir Adolphe Caron from those interested in Government railway subsidies, were expended and distributed by Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe Caron, and in lavish and illegal amounts, to assist in the election of themselves and of other supporters of the Government, in the district of Quebec, at the "general elections of 1887."

"That the said Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe Caron were then, and are "now, members of this House, and on the roll of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for "Canada, and the said Sir Adolphe Caron is a Cabinet Minister and Postmaster General."

"That, in the opinion of this House, the said Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe Caron are deserving of the severest censure for their connection with the said transactions, and that it is a public scandal and an injury to the reputation of Canada that "Sir Adolphe Caron should continue to hold the position of a Minister of the Crown."

"And the question being put on the amendment; it was negatived on a division."

### **BOWELL AND THE BLIND SHARES.**

In 1882 a craze set in for the formation of Colonization Companies in the Northwest. The plan was to secure an Order-in-Council from the Dominion Government granting large tracts of land at low prices to individuals who would then form a joint stock company to buy out their grants. For this purpose a member of the House of Commons, now deceased, associated himself with Mr. James C. Jamieson, a son-in-law of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, then and now a Minister of the Crown, and they procured for themselves and ten others in April, 1882, an Order-in-Council granting them several townships of very choice land. Mr. Bowell was consulted about it before the Order-in-Council was passed, and knew of the exceedingly advantageous "deal" that had been arranged for the profit of his supporter in the House, and for his son-in-law. Both of those gentlemen were to receive what was called "blind shares" in the stock of the company, that is stock on which they were to receive all the profits without paying any money into the company. A company called "The Prince Albert Colonization Company," was accordingly organized with twelve shareholders, ten of whom were paying parties, and the aforesaid two gentlemen were non-paying holders of "blind shares," each to the extent of \$33,000.

It is true that Mr. Jamieson had to pay another party \$500 to get in on the ground floor, but so warm an interest was taken by Mr. Bowell in this clever scheme of making money out of the Government grant that he offered to lend, and did lend, to Mr. Jamieson this \$500, which was afterwards repaid to Mr. Bowell when Mr. Jamieson sold out his blind shares for cash.

On the demand of Mr. Edgar, M. P., these charges were referred for investigation to the Committee of Privileges and Elections. They were proved to be literally true; yet by a majority composed entirely of Ministers themselves, Mr. Bowell was whitewashed by the Committee, and his conduct was declared to be beyond reproach. This report was laid before the House of Commons on 18th May, 1886, but although the House sat until 2nd June, the Government did not dare to move for its adoption. The position therefore is that Sir Mackenzie Bowell was accused in the House of conduct of which he himself said: "These statements affect not only my position as a Minister of the Crown but my reputation as a public man." These charges, so serious and disgraceful to a Minister and a public man, stand of record yet against him on the journals of the House of Commons. They have not been dealt with by the House. Are they wiped out by reason of his elevation to the Senate? He allowed the Session and the Parliament, in which the charges were made, to pass without a move, satisfied apparently with the whitewash of a packed committee, and a verdict cast by his own colleagues on that committee. Is this the stainless Premier, the pure and lofty statesman, who leads the Conservative party of Canada to-day?

No wonder that he moved the resolution to burk enquiry into the charges made against his colleague, Sir Adolphe Caron, in 1892. "A fellow-feeling made him wondrous kind."

#### **CORRUPT SALE OF PUBLIC OFFICES.—THE COCHRANE CASE.**

From 1888 to 1890 the patronage of the County of East Northumberland was in the hands of Edward Cochrane, Conservative M. P. The completion of the Murray Canal gave a number of positions as keepers of swing bridges across the canal to be awarded to political supporters by Mr. Cochrane.

There was at that time also a vacancy to be filled by him in the position of keeper of the Presque Isle Light House.

A committee of Mr. Cochrane's supporters was organized for the express purpose of corruptly trafficking in these offices, and with the full knowledge of Mr. Cochrane they did corruptly sell and dispose of such offices.

Hedley Simpson paid \$200 for the Light House position, and each of the following persons paid from \$125 to \$200 apiece for the petty positions of keepers of swing bridges, namely: Wesley Goodrich, John D. Clouston, William Brown, Robert May and Thomas Fitzgerald.

When Mr. Cochrane, M. P., was informed that the price of the berths had been duly paid, he recommended to the Government the appointment of these men, and the appointments were promptly made.

The proceeds of these corrupt sales were applied to the political purposes of the Conservative party in the riding, and in part to pay off a promissory note on which Mr. Cochrane, M. P., was personally liable.

Mr. M. C. Cameron, M. P., brought these matters before the House, and this flagrant and miserable abuse of patronage, and this sale of public offices, were proved before a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1891. A mild censure of the system of sale of public offices was passed, but the whitewash brush was applied, and the Government majority refused to condemn the conduct of the member who not only escaped censure but has been treated by his party as a martyr, a hero, and a victim of Grit persecution ever since.

#### **BUYING UP A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.—THE TURCOTTE CASE**

Mr. A. J. Turcotte, the present M. P. for Montmorenci County, was elected on 11th March, 1892. He is now a very active personal ally and supporter of Sir Adolphe Caron. At the time of his election he was carrying on a grocery business in Quebec in partnership with Mr. Provost. The firm then had a contract with the Government in the name of Mr. Provost, for the supply of the Militia at the Citadel of Quebec with groceries and provisions, and up to the dissolution of the firm on 2nd February, 1893, they received from the Government cheques amounting to \$4,112.85. This amount was all paid over by the firm to Mr. Turcotte for his private benefit.



After the dissolution of the firm, Mr. Turcotte continued in the grocery business and supplied the Militia Department with the goods. For these he received all the payment for his own benefit, although the cheques, as before, continued to be issued in Mr. Provost's name, and were endorsed by him over to Mr. Turcotte who cashed them.

It is of course grossly improper for a member to be sitting in the House drawing pay from contracts let to him by the Ministers. He is in fact sold to them, and does not represent the people, but is the slave of the Government.

The law condemns this sort of thing very clearly, for section 10 of the Independence of Parliament Act, says:

"No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the offices of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in the said House."

Yet in spite of the plain language of the statute, the Government majority in the House on 13th July, 1894, was called upon to whitewash Mr. Turcotte in the face of sworn evidence proving the above facts.

On that date, Mr. Edgar, M.P., moved a resolution declaring that Mr. Turcotte had forfeited his seat.

Four Conservative members refused to swallow the scandalous whitewashing vote, but all the rest were whipped into line, voted down Mr. Edgar's motion, and had to justify by their votes the clearest breach of the Independence of Parliament that was ever proved before a committee.

Under that precedent, members can be safely bought up by public money, like sheep in a market, to support any government that happens to be in power.

#### **FAVORITISM AND EXTRAVAGANCE.**

The Honorable John Haggart, Minister of Railways and Canals, represented his present constituency of South Lanark in 1882, and used his influence with the Government to induce them to undertake the construction, at public expense, of a short canal of six miles in length (called the Tay canal) from the Rideau canal to the town of Perth, with a branch to Mr. Haggart's own mill in that town. The estimated cost, inclusive of certain land and damages, was \$132,660. The actual cost has amounted to the enormous sum of \$476,128.

Is this immense expenditure justified by traffic upon the Tay canal? On the contrary it is navigated only by some skiffs, one scow, two yachts and two tugs. The total revenue from this canal for the year ending January 1st, 1894, was \$135.76, while the actual cost of maintenance was for this same period, \$2,486.00. Here is an instance of grossly excessive expenditure which lays the member who forced it upon the Government for his own advantage, open to the charge of being utterly unfit to manage the Department of Railways and Canals.

A resolution condemning that expenditure was moved in 1894 by Mr. John Charlton, M.P., but was voted down by the usual Government majority.

#### **CURRAN BRIDGE SCANDAL.**

The story of the construction of two Government bridges over the Lachine canal (commonly called the Curran bridges), involves as startling a disclosure of incompetence, extravagance and criminal neglect of duty as has yet been made in Canada. The responsible head of the Department is Honorable John Haggart, Minister of Railways and Canals, and the work was all done in the City of Montreal within telephoning distance of the Minister's office. The bridges were constructed during the first four months of the year 1893. The Department decided to have the work on the sub-structures of the bridges done by day labor. The contract for such labor was entered into with a contractor named St. Louis, a Government election pusher, who carried out the work as laid out by the Department and under its superintendence and direction.

The original estimate of cost of these sub-structures was \$122,000, but the accounts presented to the Department for that work have amounted to \$430,325, and of this sum \$394,000 has actually been paid to the contractor by the Government.

In order to illustrate the nature of the outrageous overcharges a few examples may be given. The supply of timber and lumber paid for is over 1,000,000 feet board measure, more than could have been used in those works. The cost of stone cutting on one of the bridges, if it had been let at the usual prices by piecework, would have been \$3,000, whereas the amount paid by the Government, including the contractor's price, is \$16,715, and the cost of stone-cutting on the other bridge was still more excessive. The prices paid by the Department to the contractor for labor were greatly beyond current prices, in some instances being as high as \$12 for work for which the contractor only paid \$4.50, and \$9.20 for other work for which the contractor only paid \$3.75. These facts cannot be contradicted or denied as they have been proved on several occasions, and Mr. Haggart, while not denying them is pursuing a somewhat cowardly course of throwing the whole blame upon subordinate officers of his Department.

The people of Canada, however, pay Mr. Haggart a very large salary for looking after this business for them, and it is a monstrous proposition that he, the responsible Minister of the Crown, should be able to clear his skirts by blaming subordinate officers and contractors whom he appointed and paid. Mr. St. Louis, the contractor, excuses himself on the ground that he was forced to contribute so much money to the election of the Conservative party that he had to make it up out of contracts. In order to avoid the exposure of particulars of his political contributions, all his books connected with the matter were burnt. It is possible that the inward history of this disgraceful transaction will never be known, but the Government and their followers who defended it by their votes last session will be held to strict account when they appear before their electors. Sir Richard Cartwright on the 18th July, 1894, moved a resolution in the House of Commons exposing and condemning this transaction, but it was voted down by the usual Government majority.

#### REFUSAL OF ENQUIRY.

When charges of misconduct have been made against Ministers in the House of Commons the Government have sometimes altered the charges. There is another instance where a serious charge was made against a Minister of the Crown, and the Government called on their majority in Parliament to vote down and refuse any inquiry whatever into the matters charged. This was notably the case when in 1891 Mr. J. F. Lister, M.P., brought serious charges against Hon. John Haggart in connection with the Section B. contract. On the 13th September, 1891, he made the following motion:

"That James Frederick Lister, Esquire, the member representing the electoral district of West Lambton in this House, having declared from his seat in this House that he is credibly informed, and that he believes that he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence:

"That in the year 1879 Messrs. Alexander Manning, Alexander Shields, John James Macdonald, Alexander McDonnell, James Isbester and Peter McLaren entered into a contract with the Government of Canada for the construction of a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Port Arthur and Rat Portage known as Section B.

"The said contract and the works in connection therewith were completed by the said contractors to whom they were a source of great profit.

"During the whole period covered by the said contract, the Honorable John G. Haggart, now Postmaster-General and a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, was a member of the House of Commons for the South Riding of Lanark, and still is such member.

"That the said Honorable John G. Haggart became and was beneficially interested in the profits of said contract which accrued to the share thereof standing in the name of the said Peter McLaren, and has received large sums out of the said profits, and has otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom.

"That during the progress of the said works, and while the said Honorable John G. Haggart was so interested therein, members of the said firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada for large contributions for political purposes,

and such contributions were paid out of the moneys of the said firm, and with the knowledge and assent of the said Honorable John G. Haggart were charged against the profits of the firm; and while the said contributions were so demanded and paid, the said firm of contractors were in various ways dependent upon the Government by reason of many matters being unsettled and in dispute in relation to the said contract, which were at the time of such contributions or subsequently, settled not unfavorably to the said contractors.

"That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and to employ shorthand writers to take down such evidence as they may deem necessary, and to have the evidence printed from day to day for the use of the Committee, and that the Committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and all their proceedings on the reference, and the result of their enquiries, and that rule 78 of this House as to the selection of committees be suspended and that the said committee be composed of Messrs. Mills (Bothwell), Edgar, Barron, Lister (who shall not have the right to vote), Dickey, Wood (Brockville), Girouard and McLeod."

This motion was voted down by the usual Government majority ..

## 4.—Demand Strictest Economy.— Decreased Expenditure.

"We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the Governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country."

### THE PUBLIC DEBT.

The public debt of Canada is a heavy burden and a serious drag upon our progress, and the gross interest charge, amounting for the year 1894 to \$10,212,596, is an onerous annual drain which can only be reduced by the diminution of the public debt. This debt has been recklessly incurred and the spending of the money has no doubt been a pleasant pastime. The payment of the debt will be a different matter and will cost effort, self-denial, economy and sacrifice.

On June 30th, 1894, the gross public debt amounted to \$308,348,023. From this amount, according to the Public Accounts, is to be deducted assets to the amount of \$62,164,994, leaving the net debt at that date \$246,183,029. This sum is equal to a charge of \$50 per head upon each individual in the Dominion and is a mortgage of \$10 per acre on each acre of improved land in the Dominion. Our assets would not realize their nominal value and our actual net debt, with the increase since June 30th last, will not at this moment fall short of \$260,000,000, taking into account the difference between actual and nominal value of assets. It is to be borne in mind that the Finance Minister has recently borrowed over \$11,000,000 in England and that the deficit for the present fiscal year commencing July 1st already exceeds \$2,000,000.

The net debt has increased \$105,821,960 since Mr. Mackenzie went out of office in 1878. The increase of the debt during Mr. Mackenzie's term of office was due entirely to engagements to which the country was committed by his predecessors, such as the Intercolonial Railway, the Pacific Railway, the enlargement of the canals and other public works, and the responsibility for the entire increase of the public debt from \$75,728,641, the figure at which it stood in 1868, to the figures of the present moment,



lies with the Conservative administration that preceded and the administrations that have followed Mr. Mackenzie's.

Unfortunately for Canada, the vast sums we have borrowed have been invested in such a way as to be almost wholly unproductive. The \$45,000,000 put into the Intercolonial Railway makes no return, and additional sums have been required to pay running expenses. The Canadian Pacific swallowed \$63,000,000 in hard cash, besides a land grant and a Government guarantee of bonds, while with the sensible and prudent policy advocated by the Liberal party less than one-half of the cash outlay would have secured the road quite soon enough for the real needs of the country. The Tay Canal was built merely for the purpose of securing the expenditure of a large sum of money in a riding to strengthen the Government candidate. This utterly useless work cost \$476,000. Last year the cost of maintenance was \$2,436, and the entire revenue from the work \$135.76. The Curran Bridge job resulted in saddling upon the country the sum of \$394,000 as the cost of a work that should have been constructed for \$160,000. Vast sums of money have been squandered by the corrupt manipulation of contracts for public works through the criminal complicity of the Public Works Department, as in the case of the Quebec Harbor job. Waste, extravagance, and corrupt use of public moneys have characterized the fiscal management of the Government since 1879.

One of the forms of corrupt waste of public money of which the Government is guilty is the granting of subsidies to local railway lines for purely political purposes, and without reference to the general good or the public interest. These grants are almost invariably made for the purpose of political effect. They are bribes offered to ridings, the prices of support paid to localities. Often members of Parliament are interested in subsidized lines, and the grants serve the double purpose of influencing ridings and securing the slavish support of members of the House of Commons. The subsidy grants up to June 30th, 1894, amounted to \$48,167,801. From this amount deduct the \$25,000,000 subsidy granted to the Canadian Pacific, and there remains \$23,167,801 as the amount taken or yet to be taken from the people by the Government to serve the purpose of a wholesale bribery fund, besides which grants to a large amount have been made, payable in instalments, and extending over a term of years.

#### **PUBLIC EXPENDITURE HAS INCREASED ALARMINGLY**

Since Confederation in 1867 the public expenditure has increased alarmingly. Commencing with \$13,486,092 in 1867-8, it had risen to \$37,585,025 in 1893-4. On July 1st, 1868, the estimated population of the Dominion was 3,520,000. On July 1st, 1894, the estimated population was but little over 5,000,000, showing an increase of population during the period of a fraction over 42 per cent., while the increase of expenditure for the same period was \$24,098,933 or 178 per cent. The increase of the net debt during the same period was \$170,454,588, or 225 per cent.

Mr. Mackenzie came into office November 8th, 1873. The expenditure for that fiscal year amounted to \$23,316,316; 1877-8 was his last full fiscal year in office and the expenditure for that year was \$23,503,158—an increase for the term of only \$186,842. For a portion of the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1879, Mr. Mackenzie's administration was responsible as it held office till October 10th, 1878, making three months and ten days of the year, and if a comparatively exact statement of the increase of expenditure under Mr. Mackenzie's administration is desired, the supply bill for 1878-9 will furnish the data.

In no year during Mr. Mackenzie's administration did the expenditure exceed the amount of the supply bill for that year. The supply bill for 1878-9 amounted to \$23,669,000, and his administration would not have exceeded that amount. Had he remained in office, therefore till July 1st, 1879, the increase of expenditure during his administration would have been \$353,000. That the expenditure for 1878-9 actually reached the sum of \$24,455,381 is due to the fact that for nine months of the year Mr. Mackenzie's successors administered the finances.

During Mr. Mackenzie's administration the contracts and obligations left by his predecessors rendered an increase of the debt necessary, and, of course, rendered an addition to the annual interest charge unavoidable, but so great was the economy and prudence of his administration that during his term of office, the controllable expenditure was reduced by the sum of \$1,781,000, and the taxation from customs duties fell from \$14,325,192 in 1873-4 to \$12,900,659 in 1878-9 (a decrease of \$1,424,533).

By selecting the period commencing July 1st, 1881, and ending July 1st, 1891, an exact comparison can be made for the decade between the increase of debt, of expenditure and of customs taxation on the one hand and the increase of population on the other hand.

Population, 1881 .. . . .	4,324,810
"    1891 .. . . .	4,832,239
Increase .. . . .	508,429
Percentage of increase .. . . .	11.66
Net debt, 1881 .. . . .	\$155,395,780
"    1891 .. . . .	237,809,030
Increase .. . . .	\$82,413,250
Percentage of increase .. . . .	53
Expenditure, 1881 .. . . .	\$25,502,554
"    1891 .. . . .	36,343,567
Increase of expenditure .. . . .	\$10,841,013
Percentage of increase .. . . .	42
Taxation by customs duties, 1881 .. . . .	\$18,406,092
"    "    "    1891 .. . . .	23,399,300
Increase .. . . .	\$4,993,208
Percentage of increase .. . . .	27

#### INCREASE OF THE CONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURE.

The statistics relating to the increase of the controllable expenditure since 1878 are of a most unsatisfactory character. The increase of population between July 1st, 1878, and July 1st, 1893, has not exceeded 21 per cent. advance upon the population in the first year named. During the same period the proportion of increase in controllable expenditure has been very much greater. In 1878 the expenditure on account of Administration of Justice, Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, Fisheries, Quarantine, Indians Legislation, Militia and Defence, Public Works, Superannuation, Excise, Northwest Territories Government, Mail subsidies and Steamship subventions, Civil Government, Adulteration of Food, Mounted Police and Miscellaneous amounted to \$5,256,424. The expenditure for the same purpose in 1893 amounted to \$10,384,272, an increase of 97 per cent. during a period when the population increased 21 per cent. Some of the items of increase need no comment as will be seen by reference to the following statement:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, 1878 .. . . .	\$92,365
"    "    "    1893 .. . . .	258,635
Increase .. . . .	\$166,270
Percentage of increase .. . . .	180
Fisheries 1878 .. . . .	\$93,262
"    1893 .. . . .	482,381
Increase .. . . .	\$389,119
Percentage of increase .. . . .	417
Quarantine, 1878 .. . . .	\$26,340
"    1893 .. . . .	101,954
Increase .. . . .	\$76,610
Percentage of increase .. . . .	287
Indians, 1878 .. . . .	\$421,503
"    1893 .. . . .	956,552
Increase .. . . .	\$535,049
Percentage of increase .. . . .	126

Militia and Defence, 1878 .. . . .	\$618,136
“ “ 1893 .. . . .	1,419,745
Increase .. . . .	\$801,609
Percentage of increase .. . . .	129
Public Works, 1878 .. . . .	\$997,469
“ “ 1893 .. . . .	1,927,832
Increase .. . . .	\$930,363
Percentage of increase .. . . .	93
Superannuation, 1878 .. . . .	\$106,588
“ 1893 .. . . .	263,710
Increase .. . . .	\$157,122
Percentage of increase .. . . .	147
Excise, 1878 .. . . .	\$215,024
“ 1893 .. . . .	387,673
Increase .. . . .	\$172,649
Percentage of increase .. . . .	80
Northwest Territories Government, 1878 .. . . .	\$18,199
“ “ “ 1893 .. . . .	276,446
Increase .. . . .	\$258,247
Percentage of increase .. . . .	1,420
Civil Government, 1878 .. . . .	\$823,369
“ 1893 .. . . .	1,367,570
Increase .. . . .	\$544,201
Percentage of increase .. . . .	66
Mounted Police, 1878 .. . . .	\$334,748
“ “ 1893 .. . . .	615,479
Increase .. . . .	\$280,731
Percentage of increase .. . . .	83

It is time to call a halt. The march of corruption has been continued too long. With increase in debt, expenditure, and taxation, so far outstripping increase of population, the result, if we do not change our course, will be serious if not disastrous. Already the consequences of extravagance and corrupt waste of money and resources are severely felt. The population of the country is almost at a standstill. Without increase of population our undeveloped resources cannot be utilized. Without a radical reform in the administration of our public affairs the increase of population and the corresponding increase of wealth and property will be meagre and unsatisfactory. Is it not time for patriotic citizens of all shades of politics to give the situation of the country careful consideration, and is it not evident that the record made by the party in power since 1878 warrants the belief that the principles, the purposes, and the methods of its leaders now in office render them incapable of giving the country an honest and economical administration of its affairs? To other men must be assigned the task of extricating the country from the difficulties that now confront it.



## 5.—FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT—INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

"That the Convention regrets that by the action of Ministers and their supporters in Parliament, in one case in which serious charges were made against a Minister of the Crown, investigation was altogether refused, while in another case the charges preferred were altered and then referred to a commission appointed upon the advice of the Ministry, contrary to the well settled practice of Parliament; and this Convention affirms:

"That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against Ministers of the Crown, and the reference of such matters to royal commissions created upon the advice of the accused is at variance with the due responsibility of Ministers to the House of Commons, and tends to weaken the authority of the House over the Executive Government; and this Convention affirms that the power of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fitting occasions be upheld."

It is, indeed, very important that the people of Canada see to it that the House of Commons should be something more than a mere echo of the Ministers of the Crown. The House is the representative body of the nation, and, in a healthy condition of public affairs, the House of Commons determines the character and policy of the administration. When the founders of Parliamentary Government in Canada were seeking to get rid of the abuses which had grown up under the family compact, they deliberately decided in favor of the English Parliamentary system, rather than the American form of Government, which is wholly without the unity and concerted action which distinguishes the system for many years firmly established in England, and which Robert Baldwin and his associates introduced here. There is no department of the Government into the management of which the House of Commons has not a right to inquire. It is essential that the House of Commons, which alone is authorized to act as an inquisitorial body on behalf of the nation, which alone grants public aid and regulates the public burdens, should have ultimate supervision over the public expenditure, and should possess whatever power is necessary to make that supervision effective. The powers of the House of Commons, in this regard have been copied from those possessed by the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. It is of the first consequence that the House should possess the power to inquire into charges of misconduct against the Ministers of the Crown. Ministers are not only the advisers of the Crown on questions of public policy, but they are a committee of the House for the expenditure of the moneys voted for various branches of the public service. If Ministers have not asked or obtained a sufficient amount for any specific purpose, they must come to Parliament and ask for whatever more may be necessary. They cannot take the surplus of one vote to make up the deficiency of another. If more has been appropriated for any service than was required it lapses. The grant of each sum is for the purpose designated and by the law of Parliament can be used for that purpose and no other. A very long experience has shown those rules and regulations to be of the highest consequence. Had it not been so, they would not in the United Kingdom have been guarded with so much care and enforced with so much strictness.

It is of the first consequence, that the power to inquire into charges of misconduct in office, against Ministers of the Crown and other high officials should continue, and no greater outrage could well be committed, than for the House of Commons either to burk inquiry or to undertake to stifle investigation, by delegating their functions to some other body. The Ministers of the Crown, as the responsible parties for the work of the executive government, are authorized by statutes to cause a commission to issue, to inquire into the conduct of subordinate officers, who are responsible to them, and for

whose conduct, in the discharge of their public duties, they themselves are responsible to Parliament. It is too absurd a contention to require an elaborate reply, that the powers which enable a Ministry to inquire into the conduct of a subordinate official, also warrant them to issue a commission to inquire into the conduct of one of themselves. Every Minister knows whether the charges made against him are true or false. He requires no inquisitorial body to make investigation for his information. When a charge of misconduct is made against a Minister in the House of Commons, it is a part of the duty of the House to give effect to its inquisitorial functions and to investigate the charges so made. The House of Commons is elected for this purpose, no less than for the purpose of legislation. It would be as derelict in duty to delegate away the one power as the other. There is not to be found, during the whole of this century an instance in which the House of Commons in the United Kingdom has declined to inquire into a charge made by a member in his place in the House against a fellow-member, or against a Minister of the Crown, affecting his character or standing, as such, which the House has refused to investigate. To denude the House of Commons of these powers would inevitably lead to corruption and malfeasance in office, and would greatly impair and ultimately destroy our parliamentary system. It is from the power to grant public supplies, and to exercise an efficient supervision over their expenditure, that the paramount authority of the House of Commons has arisen, and it is only by the strict maintenance of these powers that that paramount authority can be maintained, and the total disregard of these constitutional rights and guarantees in the present Parliament, if persisted in, must be destructive of Ministerial responsibility. In England, the House of Commons inquired into the charges against Lord Melville, respecting the application of moneys issued to the Treasury of the Navy for naval services to other purposes than those to which they had been voted. And, upon the report of a committee, Lord Melville was impeached before the House of Lords. There are many other cases, such as that of Mr. Harvey, Mr. Ferrand, Mr. Clive, Mr. Butt, and others, which show what the law of Parliament is. That wherever a charge is made affecting injuriously the public conduct of a member, and the member making the charge declares that, if granted a committee, he will be able to establish it, such committee has been invariably granted.

During the existence of the present Dominion Parliament the law of Parliament has been ignored, and upon various pretexts inquiry into charges of the very gravest character has been voted down. In a brief sketch it is impossible to give full particulars of occasions when Parliament refused to exercise its undoubted right and inquire into matters regarding public expenditure. In the article on the third resolution, however, a few cases are briefly dealt with. It was the undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into these matters. They were matters of public expenditure; the charges were charges of misconduct in office against Ministers of the Crown. They were fitting occasions to assert the superintending authority of the House of Commons, and the responsibility of Ministers to the House and to the country, for the proper discharge of their duties.

---

## 6.—THE LAND FOR THE SETTLER—NOT FOR THE SPECULATOR.

"That in the opinion of this Convention the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler."

### UNDEVELOPED RESOURCES.

The question of the management and the disposal of the public lands is one of prime importance. The wilderness areas of Canada contain the great bulk of its undeveloped material resources of soil, forest and mine. The agriculturist alone can make an element of progress and power of the latent resources of the soil. The pioneer settler is a nation builder, and his strong arm must win from the virgin soil the most important of the victories over nature that add to the growth and stability of the state. Without the intervention of his efforts the wilderness is only rich in future possibilities; with the aid of his courage, self denial and industry, it becomes the theatre of incessant activities and the secure foundation of the nation's future.

If the labors of the settler are so essential to the state, in making from its wild lands innumerable homes for citizens and taxpayers, he should receive due consideration and every just measure of protection. The land grabber and the speculator are his natural enemies. Their operations retard the settlement of the public lands and add greatly to the difficulty of the settler in obtaining a home. The public lands are not an active element of national power till brought under cultivation, and any policy that retards settlement is a bad one. Hence no middleman in land transactions should be allowed to come between the Government and the settler, for the middleman's gain is the settler's loss and the Government's loss as well, because it retards settlement and checks progress. The true policy to pursue is to grant or sell lands to actual settlers only upon conditions of occupation, and to use every effort to promote the speedy settlement of the public domain.

Unfortunately the Government does not, and has not in the past pursued the line of policy above indicated, and its land policy is deserving of severe censure. Several reprehensible features of that policy may be alluded to.

### SCATTERED HOMESTEAD GRANTS.

Its system of making homestead grants prevents contiguous homestead settlement and permits of but thirty-two allotments in each township of thirty-six square miles, these allotments being separated from each other in such a manner as to throw the greatest possible difficulties in the way of the homestead settler in maintaining schools, churches and highways. Had the object been to render homestead settlement difficult the plan adopted would have served the purpose admirably. If, however, rapid and successful settlement were the object, the American plan of granting homesteads on all lands subject to sale or entry, would have been the proper one.

### PASTURE LAND LEASES.

The Government has pursued the policy of making pasture land leases to cattle kings at a nominal rent of one to two cents per acre without asking for bids or seeking competition, and only with a limit of 50,000 acres as the amount that might be covered by a single lease. In this way several millions of acres have been leased. These leases interfere with settlement and are inimical to the interests of the settlers when covering any district suitable for cultivation.



### SALES TO SPECULATORS.

This disregard of the Government for the interests of the settler was strikingly manifested by the so-called colonization plans adopted in December, 1881. Under the provision of these plans, speculators were enabled to buy the public lands not reserved for railways, the Hudson Bay Company or school purposes, in townships, or blocks of townships, at one-half the price charged to the actual settler. By the provisions of one of these plans purchases were for cash; by the provisions of the other plan credit on easy terms, extending over a period of five years was given. The rush of speculators under the credit plan was phenomenal. On January 1st, 1883, a little over a year after the order was issued, the applications under the credit plan numbered 251 and covered 2,295 townships of land. Among the applicants were 21 members of Parliament, supporters of the Government, whose applications covered about 150 townships. While slow settlement of the Northwest and other circumstances caused most of these speculative schemes to collapse, it was through no act of the Government that an enormous area of public land was withheld from the hands of the speculators, who would have extorted from the actual settler many times the price per acre that the Government had received.

### THE TIMBER LIMITS GRANT

A scandalous instance of the disregard of the Government for the general public interest is furnished by the timber limit policy in vogue up to the year 1887. Previous to that date timber limits were granted to friends of the Government upon private application without being advertised or offered at public competition and were granted upon the payment of \$5 per square mile. One limit thus obtained by John Charles Rykert for the sum of \$250, was sold soon after for \$150,000. Up to February, 1885, 550 Orders-in-Council granting limits were issued. These orders covered an area of 25,300 square miles. Of these grants twenty-six were made to Conservative members of Parliament upon their own application, and seventy-nine grants were made to friends of Conservative members of Parliament upon the application of members; and nearly, if not all, of the grants made were to Conservative friends of the Government. A more reprehensible abuse of power can scarcely be conceived. The enormous public loss thus deliberately inflicted by the Government may be better understood by referring to the timber sale of the Province of Ontario held in the autumn of 1881, when at public auction bonuses amounting to \$730,801 were received for 1,412 square miles—an average of \$517 bonus per square mile. The Dominion grants under consideration were mostly made at a date subsequent to the Ontario sale alluded to, and at the rate of bonuses then received, the Dominion Government should have received upon the 25,300 square miles granted, bonuses to the amount of \$13,080,000. While it is not claimed that this amount could have been realized from an honest, properly advertised sale, it is claimed that the vast area should not have been given away to favorites, but should have been sold at public auction if sold at all. Fortunately a considerable portion of the area thus granted was within the limits of the disputed territory, and when the claim of Ontario to its ownership was confirmed, the Mowat Government speedily annulled the entire batch of swindles perpetrated by the Dominion Government within its bounds.

### LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

The policy of the Government with regard to railway land grants has been wasteful and indefensible. Grants have been made to branches of the C.P.R. that would have been built by the company's feeders of the main line without aid. In one instance a grant of land was made to a 60-mile section of the Souris branch of the C.P.R. after it was actually constructed, followed by a grant to another section of 32 miles on the same line after it also was completed. Speculative railway charters fortified by land grants have been repeatedly granted, to be hawked around for sale, and such charters have often been renewed when about to lapse. In the matter of railway land grants the Government has ever seemed ready to second the purposes of mere speculators and adventurers.

Up to January 1st, 1894, 44,242,298 acres of public land had been granted by the Government in Manitoba and the Canadian Northwest, in aid of railway construction. On the basis of the present cultivated area of the Dominion, this is an amount more than sufficient to furnish homes and support to 10,000 000 people, and with the exception of the grant to the main line of the C. P. R. it may reasonably be doubted whether any of the grants were required to secure the construction of branch and other lines as fast as the wants of the country required and business could be furnished to pay running expenses.

#### **LIBERAL RECORD ON LAND QUESTION**

The policy of the public lands for the actual settler and not for the speculator, has been advocated by the Liberal party from the time our Public Land Policy first received serious consideration. On April 12th, 1882, a resolution affirming this principle was moved in the House of Commons by Mr. Charlton, and after full discussion was defeated by a strict party vote. Yeas, 47; nays, 112. The principle was again affirmed by the Liberal Convention at Ottawa in June, 1893, and once more by resolution moved in the House of Commons in the session of 1894, which was defeated June 7th on a strict party vote. Yeas, 47; nays, 100.

The Liberal party have always favored dense and continuous settlements. They have opposed the adoption of a policy which is annually spreading the population over distant districts and sections of country which necessitates further railway construction, further land grants for that purpose, enhanced prices of lands to the settler, without affording to the existing railway lines that amount of travel and of traffic, which will enable companies to pay the expenses of operation and management, without excessive burdens upon the people who may reside in the country through which they run. The people of Canada have paid a large sum to extinguish the claim of the Hudson's Bay Company to the lands in question; they have paid a still larger sum for the extinguishment of the Indian title. They spend annually several hundred thousand dollars for the maintenance of police; they have opened up that country with railways that have cost the people of Canada about sixty millions of dollars. The people have but to look at the present settlement of the Northwest, and the revenues derived from that section of the Dominion, in order to see how very inadequate the return is for the \$100,000,000 which it has already cost the people of Canada.

---

## 7.—OPPOSE THE DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT— FAVOR THE PROVINCIAL FRANCHISE.

"That the Franchise Act since its introduction has cost the Dominion Treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties;

"That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million;

"That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances been prevented from exercising their natural rights;

"That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction;

"That it has produced gross abuses by partizan revising barristers appointed by the Government of the day;

"That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many Provinces of the Dominion, and that in the opinion of this Convention the Act should be repealed, and we should revert to the Provincial Franchise."

### OBJECTIONABLE IN EVERY WAY.

Perhaps the most universally condemned piece of legislation is that known to the country as the Dominion Franchise Act. So excessively unpopular has it become, that the party who, as a body defend it, as individuals find no language too strong with which to condemn it. It was conceived, not, as claimed, to secure uniform franchise, but to have the means at hand ready, should the necessity arise, of embarrassing, prejudicing and injuring political opponents. The marked differences in the economic conditions of our people made it possible to possess uniformity of franchises from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This was quickly seen and as quickly admitted, for in the very Act itself the basis of qualification in British Columbia was made different to that in the other Provinces of the Dominion. As this was forcibly pointed out, by the Hon. David Mills, Mr. William Paterson and others in the House in 1885 when the Act was passed, they urged that inasmuch as the reasons advanced for this useless legislation by its authors, could not and did not exist, that the Act should not be passed. None the less it became law, clearly indicating that the professed object was but the veneration of a real design to possess at hand a powerful engine wherewith to destroy the Liberals before the battle began. Amendments to the Act have still further varied the basis of qualifications. Though the reason, as offered for its enactment, has long since disappeared the law is still retained. The Act was bad in its intention, and its intention has been faithfully fulfilled in its operation. Forseeing its evils upon the body politic, the Liberals day after day, and night after night, unceasingly and without rest battled with and fought it in its passage through the House. It was this grand stand, so taken by the Liberals, which secured the right of appeal from revising officers who are not judges, without which right temporary appointees could with impunity, as some even now do, assist Tory candidates in absolute defiance of all rules of evidence and justice. This right of appeal acts in some cases as a deterrent against flagrant partiality, yet the opportunity and facility for friendly assistance is rendered easy, and at the same time so difficult to prevent, that the real design of this Act is fairly well accomplished by many of those appointed to administer the law.

No matter how wilful the omission, no matter how bad the commission, relief cannot be had, for the law does not permit redress by mandamus or prohibition. Each officer



makes his own rules and he becomes a sort of judicial Czar, possessing the power at his will and pleasure of electing whom he wishes, and so burking the will of the people. This opportunity availed of by some, is the opportunity sought for, retained, and put in practice by Tory Governments from the earliest moment of Parliamentary history in Canada down to the present time. The working of the Act makes easy the path to perjury and fraud. Men who would scorn to do a wrong deed in private life, do not hesitate to assist, by questionable methods, in aiding their party, for they feel they have their party behind them.

### ENORMOUS COST.

This Act cost the country before the revision of 1894-95 over one million dollars, and a moderate estimate of the cost of the last revision is \$250,000.00. This is what it costs the country. This is what the people pay out of the public revenues to pay for an Act which is burdensome to them. But this is not all. Besides the cost to the treasury there is a cost to private individuals. Some idea of this additional cost can be gleaned by estimating the value of the time of citizens given to the work at what they would get if employed in any other way, as, for instance, jurors or witnesses in ordinary courts, and also the actual outlay made by individuals. There are 215 electoral districts, averaging 35 polling districts each, or in all 7,525 polling districts. There are on an estimate 1,500 sittings of courts for final revision. To prepare for the preliminary revision meetings are called and held, assessment rolls examined, canvasses made for names to add or remove, forms are printed, declarations drawn, sworn to and filed, and often professional services used; the value of time and cash outlay for each polling district averages \$10, or in all \$75,250. To prepare for final revision, including forms, notices, registrations, subpoenas and serving, at least the same average of \$10 for each district may be estimated, thus adding another \$75,250. At the sittings of courts the time of volunteer witnesses, witness fees paid, fees to lawyers, paid livery and other outlays, at least \$20 for each court may be allowed, making for the 1,500 courts \$30,000 spent, making a total for one side of \$180,500. Adding the same estimate for the other side's expenses, the result is that the country is bled by \$361,000 for the revision, besides the cost of \$250,000 to the treasury.

The revision then of 1894-5 costs the people \$611,000. They ought to register their votes against such a system of extravagance and unfairness. Since the inception of this Act the Liberals have fought firmly for its repeal and demanded that the Provincial lists be used. Their demands had considerable effect upon the late Sir John Thompson who introduced a Bill during the session of 1894 to amend the Franchise Act by adopting salient features of the Provincial lists. In his speech on June 14th, 1894, when introducing the Bill Sir John Thompson said: "The question upon which so much difference has arisen in the past as to the basis of the franchise, shall be adjusted by adopting the franchise of the several provinces. \* \* \* \* \* The number of differences which exist between the provincial franchises and the Dominion franchise as established by our own Act, are so few as not to be worth the contest and the expenses which are involved in keeping them up, and the adoption of a general system which will apply both to the Local and Dominion Legislatures, has recommendations as regards simplicity and facilities for economy, which cannot exist under a dual system such as we have been keeping up for the past few years."

Also: "It is obviously one of the most desirable features in connection with any system of franchise, and to my mind an essential feature, that the system to be adopted will be such that it can be put into operation every year."

Sir John Thompson's Bill was never passed. It was not the desire of the present Ministers that it should become law. They are in favor of the pernicious Act.

## 8.—AGAINST THE GERRYMANDER—COUNTY BOUNDARIES SHOULD BE PRESERVED.

"That by the Gerrymander Acts, the electoral divisions for the return of members to the House of Commons have been so made as to prevent a fair expression of the opinion of the country at the general elections, and to secure to the party now in power a strength out of all proportion greater than the number of electors supporting them would warrant. To put an end to this abuse, to make the House of Commons a fair exponent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that in the formation of electoral divisions, county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division."

### THE GERRYMANDER ACTS

The Liberal party at the National Convention declared as the Liberal members in the House of Commons had declared in 1882, the time the Gerrymander Act was passed, and frequently thereafter against the Gerrymander Acts, by which redistribution was made of the constituencies, after the census of 1881 and of 1891. The object of an election is to keep the House of Commons in touch with the country, and to see that it continues to be a fair exponent of its public opinion. Any system of representation which will prevent the prevailing political sentiment of the country from acquiring a paramount influence in Parliament is seriously defective. In some countries where society is segregated into order and classes, constitutions have been devised to favor certain orders and classes, and to give them representation out of all proportion greater than that to which their numerical strength would entitle them. In Canada we have no such divisions of the community. Our people are democratic. The aristocratic element which, at one time, exercised no little influence in the Province of Quebec, practically disappeared before the Provinces were thoroughly united.

Under the present constitution each Province is given its due weight in the House of Commons by having apportioned to it representation, after every decennial census, in proportion to its population. How this is to be accomplished is pointed out in section 51, which provides that the representation shall be readjusted by such authority in such manner as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides. The Parliament of Canada has never called into existence the authority by which redistribution is to be made. It has always disregarded this provision of the law, and has exercised the authority itself. This being so, it has never had any occasion to state in what manner the redistribution shall be made.

The Liberal party set out in its platform the foregoing resolution, in which it is declared that in order that the House of Commons may be so constituted as to become a fair exponent of public opinion it was desirable that in the formation of electoral divisions county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case should parts of different counties be put in one electoral division. The Liberal party in adopting this resolution simply ratified the principles which the leaders of that party affirmed in 1872, and which have been frequently defended by them on the floor of Parliament since that time. The position taken by the Liberal party in Canada upon this subject did not set out any novel or revolutionary doctrine. The opinions which they advanced and the principles which they enunciated and defended were held by leading statesmen in England in 1832, and were again recognized and acted upon by the leaders of both parties when redistribution was made in 1882. On both these occasions it was agreed that nothing could well be more destructive to true representation than to subordinate the municipal divisions of the country to mere numerical representation. The country, and not the whole country, is the unit to be divided.

### THE MUNICIPAL UNIT.

Certain relations grow up between the electors themselves, who are in the habit of acting together for various public objects and by which they are better qualified to act together for the election of members to the House of Commons. Those who are brought frequently in contact, in the discharge of public duties learn to know each other; they become acquainted with those who are best informed and who are best qualified to act as leaders and spokesmen in whatever public business they are called upon to transact. They have in their public meetings an opportunity of forming in their own minds an estimate of the capacity and fitness of the men who may aspire to represent them, for where such opportunity offers the electors will consider not only the political opinions but the private worth of those who are candidates for seats in Parliament. Where a constituency is made up of fragments wrested from several adjoining counties the electors in each are strangers to those in the others, and each has only had an opportunity of forming an opinion of the fitness of candidates from his own section, as it is only in his own section that an opportunity has been afforded him of knowing anything of the ability and character of the men who may aspire to a seat in Parliament. The candidate who resides in the county fragment that is the most populous has the best chance of success, though he may be quite inferior to the aspirants from other sections of the same constituency.

The wisdom of this view was recognized by Sir John Macdonald when the "Redistribution Act of 1872" was under consideration. On that occasion he said: "With respect to the rural constituencies, the desire of the Government has been to preserve the representation for counties and sub-divisions of counties as much as possible. It is considered objectionable to make representation a mere geographical term. It is desired as much as possible to keep the representation within the county so that each county that is a municipality of Ontario should be represented and if it becomes large enough, divide it into ridings; that principle is carried out in the suggestions" . . . but it is obvious that there is a great advantage in having counties elect men whom they know. Our municipal system gives an admirable opportunity to constituencies to select men for their deserts. We all know the process which happily goes on in Western Ontario. A young man in the county commences his public life by being elected by the neighbors who know him to the township council. If he shows himself possessed of administrative ability he is made a reeve or deputy-reeve of his county. He becomes a member of the county council, and as his experience increases and his character and ability become known, he is selected by his people as their representative in Parliament. It is, I think, a grand system that the people of Canada should have the opportunity of choosing for political promotion the men in whom they have most confidence and of whose abilities they are fully assured. All that great advantage is lost by cutting off a portion of two separate counties and adding them together for electoral purposes only. Those portions so cut off have no common interest; they do not meet together and they have no common feeling, except that once in five years they go to the polls in their own township to vote for a man who may be known in one section and not in another. This tends toward the introduction and development of the American system of caucuses, by which wire-pullers take adventurers for their political ability only, and not for any personal respect for them. So that, as much as possible, from any point of view, it is advisable that counties should refuse men whom they do not know, and when the representation is increased, it should be by sub-dividing the counties into ridings."

### THE RULE HAS BEEN DISREGARDED

To these opinions the Liberal Party cordially subscribed. At that time it was supposed that the rule, as stated by Sir John Macdonald, would at all times be strictly adhered to whenever it became necessary to readjust our representation. Unfortunately for the moral and political well-being of Canada, this rule was wholly disregarded in 1882 and in 1892. Certain members of the Conservative Party, at the request of the Government, undertook the task of making such a division of the Province of Ontario as would enable them, with so small a vote as that which they polled in 1874, to secure a return of a majority of the members from this Province to the House of Commons. It is unnecessary



to point out the mischievous effect that such a measure was calculated to have upon those who supported it. It is impossible that any man could give his sanction much less could he undertake publicly to defend a measure of this kind—unjust alike to his political opponents and to the country—without sinking to a lower moral level than he held before, and without becoming disqualified by his conduct for the work of home administration and legislation. But apart from the mischievous effect upon the House and the country in the way mentioned, it does a further mischief by violation of the principle of continuity in the representation of constituencies.

The British North American Provinces preferred, not without reason, the English system of responsible government to that system which prevails in the neighboring Republic. Under the British system, the men best qualified for the place become the leaders of their respective parties. Their ability industry and parliamentary experience render them year by year better qualified for the places which they fill, and entitle them to the increased confidence of their respective parties. Were it not for the parliamentary experience of such men, serious mistakes, which are now avoided, would be made. It is under their leadership that the new men which come in at every general election become trained to the work of legislation and government. But where county boundaries are disregarded at every readjustment there is increased danger to our institutions and increased risk of mistakes to the great detriment of the country by substituting too great a number of men without parliamentary experience for those who have seen long service.

Any alteration in our institutions which is calculated to unduly diminish the public regard for faithful service is an alteration for the worse. Now the Gerrymander Acts destroy in a large degree, in every constituency where county boundaries are disregarded, the relations which have grown up between an existing member and those whom he formerly represented. We cannot too strongly impress upon the people of Canada the wisdom of adhering to the English practice in this regard. Nothing has done more to exclude able men from the Congress of the United States than the destruction of county constituencies, and the effect which has followed it in that country is likely to flow from its introduction here. It offers to men who are ambitious and unscrupulous a strong temptation to use the power of altering the electoral divisions, for mere party purposes, until an election fails to indicate by its result the opinion of the country. The Liberal Party, therefore, in the interest of honest representation and justice to all parties and of honor in public life, insist upon the preservation of county boundaries in the redistribution of seats after each decennial census.

## 9.—THE SENATE DEFECTIVE—AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

"The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the Federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective as it makes the Senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government."

The experience of twenty-seven years has clearly demonstrated that the Canadian Senate, under the present mode of appointment, is an utterly useless appendage to the legislative machinery of Canada. It does not command popular confidence; it scarcely receives public recognition. Appointed by the Crown in the ~~ory~~, it was no doubt expected by the fathers of Confederation that dignity, impartiality and a lofty sense of duty would be the characteristics of the body. The logic of facts lays rude hands upon these pleasant anticipations. The appointments are for life. They are made by a partizan ministry. They are bestowed as a rule upon old political time-servers. No regard is paid to the propriety of having all shades of political sentiment fairly represented in the body. The Tory Party has been in power since 1878. Since that date, with possibly one or two exceptions, none but Tories have been appointed to the positions. When a Liberal senator dies his place is filled straightway by a Tory. This process has gone on till out of a body of 78 members not more than 12 Liberals are left, and were the present Government to remain in office for a few years longer the Liberal element in the Senate would become extinct. This body costs the country \$133,000 per annum. It does not render that many cents' worth of service. It offers little check to hasty or vicious legislation, and it contents itself with saying "Amen" to the decrees of the Government and strangling or impeding for years, the passage of any moral legislation that emanates from the Opposition side of the House of Commons. As the Canadian senator is never called upon to present himself to a constituency for re-election, he is naturally totally indifferent to public opinion or popular demand. Perched upon its serene height of irresponsible authority the Senate has the power to thwart popular desire for reform or defy public sentiment, however overwhelming the expression may be. Its action might easily be made most disastrous to the public weal. If it possesses any power for good it would be difficult to say when that power has been exercised. It certainly possesses vast power for mischief. Death is the only potentate, aside from a constitutional amendment, that can change its complexion. The Liberal Party very properly demands a change of the constitution that shall make the Senate a body in harmony with the principles of popular government. Details as to mode of election, length of term, vacating seat upon dissolution of Parliament and cognate questions are left for full discussion and mature, well-considered action, but the principle of responsibility to the electorate and harmony in constituting and working, with the requirements of a popular form of government, is clearly asserted and has become a cardinal point in the policy of the Liberal Party.

# THE PATRON PLATFORM.

*(Resolutions or Planks adopted in London, September, 1891.)*

## 1. Maintenance of British connection.

It is not an issue. All the political parties in Canada agree on British connection.

In the Canadian Parliamentary Session of 1890 an address was moved (29th January) by a leading Liberal from Ontario, Mr. Mulock, and unanimously adopted, conveying to Her Majesty the following emphatic assurances of the attachment of the whole people of Canada to their British connection:

"We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly, in our own name and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to your Majesty's person and Government.

"We have learned with feelings of entire disapproval that various public statements have been made calling in question the loyalty of the people of Canada to the political union now happily existing between this Dominion and the British Empire, and representing it as the desire of the people of Canada to sever such connection.

"We desire, therefore, to assure your Majesty that such statements are wholly incorrect representations of the sentiments and aspirations of the people of Canada, who are among your Majesty's most loyal subjects devotedly attached to the political union existing between Canada and the mother country and earnestly desire its continuance.

"We feel assured that your Majesty will not allow any such statements, emanating from any source whatever, to lessen your Majesty's confidence in the loyalty of your Canadian subjects to your Majesty's person and Government, and will accept our assurances of the contentment of your Majesty's Canadian subjects with the political connection between Canada and the rest of the British Empire, and of their fixed resolve to aid in maintaining the same."

Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the Liberal leader, in a speech at Quebec, January, 1894, in referring to the ideas and hopes of the Liberals, said: "We are before and above all Canadians; Canadians in the fullest acceptance of the term; Canadians at Quebec, Canadians at Toronto, and Canadians from the shores of the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the famous mountains whose feet are kissed by the waves of the Pacific and whose crests are refreshed by the balmy breezes from the Orient. (Prolonged applause.) Our great object is the development of the work of Confederation; it is to draw closer, bind and cement together the different elements scattered over the face of the whole British North America and to weld them into one nation. (Hear, hear.) This is, as I understand it, the role of the Liberal party in the Confederation, and as long as I shall have the honor to take a part in the shaping of our destinies this is the ideal towards which it shall gravitate. (Applause.)"

Mr. Laurier, speaking at Montreal, January 22nd, 1895, said: "I have stated over and over again that though I am of French origin, and though I am proud of my origin, I love England and I love British institutions. I have stated that over and over again, and I must repeat it once more, perhaps in the city of Montreal, I love England, I love British institutions, and why? Because under British institutions, under the banner of St. George, my fellow-countrymen and myself of French origin have found far greater freedom than we could ever have hoped for had we remained subjects to France. If I wanted examples or precepts of art, I would go to France; if I wanted philosophical counsels, I would go to Germany; but, for means of government, for all economic principles, I would go to the land of sound government and sound common sense, Old England. It is from that land that I take my theories, and upon that platform—between friend and foe, speaking here to-night—upon that platform exemplified as I have told you, the Liberal party of Canada will fight the next battle whenever the next battle may come."



## 2. The reservation of the public lands for the actual settler.

A principle advocated by the Liberal party from the time its policy with regard to the public lands began to receive the consideration rendered necessary by the influx of settlers into the North-West. On April 12th, 1882, Mr. Charlton made the following motion in the House of Commons: "That in the opinion of this House our aim should be to people the agricultural regions of the North-West with independent freeholders, each cultivating his own farm and paying therefor no more than the public treasury receives; and that, save in the case of town plots, or other exceptional cases, the sale of North-West agricultural lands should as a rule be made to actual settlers only, on reasonable conditions of settlement and in quantities limited to the area which can be reasonably occupied by a settler." (Hansard, 1882, p. 819).

This motion was fully debated and was defeated by a strict party vote. Yeas 47, Nays 112. (Hansard, 1882, p. 846.)

In June, 1893, the great Liberal convention which met at Ottawa reaffirmed the principle in resolution 6, as follows: "That in the opinion of this convention the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler."

A final and emphatic affirmation of the principle was made by the Liberal party in the session of 1894, when Mr. Charlton again moved in the matter. His motion, made June 1st, was as follows: "In the opinion of this House the public lands of the Dominion should be sold to actual settlers only, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler; that no sales of public lands to speculators or middlemen should be permitted; that liberal provisions should be made for free homestead grants to settlers, and that land grants to railway corporations have been made by the Government with reckless lavishness and to the serious detriment of the public interest." (Hansard, 1894, vol. 11, p. 3593.)

This motion was debated two days and on June 7th, 1894, was defeated on a strict party vote. Yeas 47, Nays 100. (Hansard, 1894, vol. 11, p. 3970.)

Thus it is seen that the policy of reserving the public lands for the actual settler was formulated by the Liberal party nearly ten years before the platform of the Patrons of Industry was adopted. (See also resolution 6 in the Liberal platform.)

## 3. Purity of administration and absolute independence of Parliament.

The Liberal party has uniformly and without a single exception, opposed and denounced the scandals, boodling and stealings for which the present Government will be remembered. The Liberal party has striven, thus far in vain, to arouse popular indignation and secure reforms. By voice and vote its representatives in Parliament have opposed timber limit, pasture lease and mining land grants, subsidies to political railway schemes, waste of public money, contract swindles and every other form of corrupt practice, and they now ask the hearty co-operation of all who desire to see purity of administration and independence of Parliament once more established. (See resolutions 3 and 5 in the Liberal platform.)

## 4. Rigid economy in every department of the public service.

A good old Liberal doctrine, honored by practice when the Liberal party was in power. From 1874 to 1878 Mr. Mackenzie only increased the expenditure by the amount of \$186,842. From 1878 to 1894 his successors have increased the expenditure by the sum of \$14,081,867, and the net public debt by the sum of \$105,821,960. Mr. Mackenzie largely decreased the controllable expenditure during his term of office, and only added to the public debt as he was constrained to do in meeting the obligations and contracts entered into by his predecessors in office. Mr. Mackenzie sustained a loss of political

support through his stern refusal to permit jobs, favoritism or waste of public funds for private and selfish purposes. The past record of the Liberal party warrants the assertion that if it is again entrusted with the administrations of the affairs of Canada it will secure economy in every department of the public service. The Liberal platform, adopted by the Liberal convention in 1893, declares in the most positive terms for purity of administration, strict economy, decreased expenditure, responsible government and independence of Parliament. (See resolution 4, Liberal platform.)

---

5. Simplification of the laws and general reduction of the machinery of government.

Quite in conformity with Liberal principles past and present. Liberal leaders contend that we have too many heads of departments, too many cabinet ministers, too many civil servants; an extravagant pay roll in the customs, interior, inland revenue, excise, weights and measures, and other branches of the public service; that we have useless and worse than useless laws, such as the Gerrymander Act and the Franchise Act; that we have too many officials, too many laws, too much machinery, and a vast burden of worse than useless expense; and these abuses the Liberal party proposes to reform when the people of Canada call it back to office. (See resolutions 7 and 8, Liberal platform.)

---

6. The abolition of the Senate. (See resolution 9, Liberal platform and article thereon.)

---

7. A system of civil service reform that will give each county power to appoint or elect all county officials paid by them except county judges.

This is an issue not connected with Dominion politics and needs no comment here.

---

8. Tariff for revenue only, and so adjusted as to fall as far as possible upon the luxuries and not upon the necessities of life.

There has been no time since Confederation when the Liberal party did not avow and act upon the principle of a revenue tariff, with duties so adjusted as to yield no more revenue than was necessary to meet the requirements of the Government when honestly and economically administered. When the slight revision of the tariff was made in 1876, and duties were advanced from 15 to 17½ per cent., the Conservative leaders condemned the Mackenzie administration for refusing to advance duties to a point high enough to afford protection to home industries, and in 1878, when the lines were being laid down for the impending appeal to the electors, the Mackenzie Government unflinchingly adhered to the policy of a low revenue tariff, while the Conservative party, under the leadership of Sir John A. Macdonald, formally took ground in favor of the National Policy by motion made March 7th, 1878. (See Hansard, 1878, vol. 1, p. 854, col. 2.) The contest was fought out upon this issue, and in an honest, determined stand for a revenue tariff the Mackenzie administration met its doom. From that time onward the Liberal party has steadfastly adhered to the revenue tariff principle, and many parliamentary motions defining the position of the party in that regard could be quoted. The freer trade and reduced taxation resolution adopted by the National Liberal Convention in June, 1893, denounces the protective principles and declares, "That the tariff should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote free trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States." (See resolution 1, Liberal platform.)

9. Reciprocal trade on fair and equitable terms between Canada and the world.

The quotation contained in the paragraph preceding this resolution defines the position of the Liberal party upon the general question of reciprocal trade. The resolution regarding enlarged markets and reciprocity, adopted by the National Liberal Convention, affirms that the period of the old reciprocity treaty with the United States was one of marked prosperity for the British North American colonies. It asserts truthfully that no honest effort has been made by the present Government to obtain such a treaty, as it would not be in the interest of the combines and monopolies whom the Government serves; and it declares that the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations to secure a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty with the United States, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles. One of the first steps of importance taken by the Mackenzie Government was the attempt to obtain a reciprocity treaty in the year 1874. A treaty which would have proved highly advantageous to Canada was negotiated by Hon. George Brown and Lord Thornton with the United States State Department, but failed to receive the sanction of the United States Senate. At no time since 1874 have the Liberal leaders ceased to desire an honorable and equitable reciprocity treaty with the United States, and when again permitted to manage negotiations there is little reason to doubt that such a treaty would soon be secured by them. (See resolutions 1 and 2, Liberal platform.)

10. Effectual legislation that will protect labor and the results of labor from those combinations and monopolies which unduly enhance the price of the articles produced by such combinations and monopolies.

Rings, combinations and monopolies can only exist in the absence of keen and untrammelled competition. Such competition can only be avoided through the intervention of a protective tariff which imposes duties designed to exclude foreign goods and prevent foreign competition. With such a tariff in force domestic manufactures can form rings and combinations and unduly enhance prices. Under a moderate revenue tariff such combinations cannot exist, because outside competition cannot be prevented. It follows that the Liberal policy of a moderate revenue tariff will effectually protect labor and the results of labor from combinations and monopolies, and the Liberal trade policy will fully meet the demand of this resolution. (See resolution 1, Liberal platform.)

11. Prohibition of the bonusing of railways by Government grants, as contrary to the public interest.

The policy of bonusing railways by cash and land grants from the Dominion Government has become a fruitful source of jobbery, speculation and corruption. Under its operation favorites of the Government have been enriched. Appropriations have been made for the sole purpose of purchasing the support of constituencies, and vast sums of public money have been voted without regard to the public interest, while millions of acres of land that should have been held in trust by the Government for the future homes of hardy and deserving settlers, have been handed over without consideration or justification, to charter-hawkers, whose intervention actually retards the construction of the lines whose franchise they control, for the purpose of extorting money from the ultimate builders of the roads. The policy of granting these subsidies has repeatedly been condemned in Parliament by the Liberal party, and this resolution is in harmony with the attitude of the Liberal party upon this question. (See resolutions 3 and 6, Liberal platform.)



12. Preparation of the Dominion and Provincial voters' lists by the municipal officers.

This is a principle that obtained in practice from the time of Confederation, 1867, till the passage of the Dominion Franchise Act in 1885. This Act was introduced March 19th, and came up for its second reading April 16th. There followed the most memorable parliamentary battle in the history of Canada. The opposition of the Liberal members to the bill was continued till the early hours of July 4th, when the bill received its third reading, and the preparation of the Dominion lists was taken from the municipal officers and placed in the hands of the revising barrister. This useless, expensive, and unjust measure has at all times received the unsparing condemnation of the Liberal party, and one of their first acts upon returning to power will be to sweep it from the statute book and return to the lists prepared by the municipal officers, and now used for Provincial purposes. (See resolution 7, Liberal platform.)

---

13. Conformity of electoral districts to county boundaries as constituted for municipal purposes, as far as the principle of representation by population will allow.

The resolution is a well deserved condemnation of the most infamous gerrymander bill of 1882, and the subsequent bill of a similar though less flagrant character. The bill of 1882 was a servile imitation of the worst form of political rascality practised in the United States. The bill readjusted the bounds of some fifty ridings without regard to county boundaries or public convenience, and deliberately disregarded popular rights. The bill was vigorously opposed by the Liberal members of Parliament, but received the solid Government support, and passed its third reading May 12th, 1882, by a strict party vote, 103 to 37. This measure also will receive the attention of the Liberal party when it comes into power, and will then cease to disgrace the Canadian statute book. At the last Dominion general election there were polled by the Liberals 182,000 votes in Ontario, and by the Conservatives 186,000. These figures are from the returns checked by the bye-elections. The Conservatives have 59 members in the House from Ontario, and the Liberals 33, but if the seats were fairly distributed the Liberals would have 45 and the Conservatives 47. For every 3,159 votes which the Conservatives received they have a member in the House, while the Liberals have a member for every 5,550 Liberal votes polled. Why should such unfairness be tolerated? (See resolution 8, Liberal platform.)

---

The Liberal party, guided by noble leaders, inspired by its history, doctrines and principles, has ever championed the rights of the people and for years has sought to remedy the abuses complained of by the Patrons of Industry. (See resolutions moved in the House of Commons by Liberals, and pages of Hansard above referred to.) Had the farmers stood firmly by the Liberal candidates and Alexander Mackenzie in 1878, the N. P. fallacy would not have been imposed upon the people. The Liberal party claims the confidence and votes of all who agree with it and profess to seek the success of its own time-honored and stoutly-maintained policy.

# A POWERFUL ARRAIGNMENT.

## Reasons why the Tory Party is no longer entitled to the confidence of the electors of Canada.

1.—Because it has increased the net public debt from \$140,362,069 in 1878 to \$246,182,029 in 1894, an increase of \$105,821,960, an average annual increase of \$6,613,872.

2.—Because it has increased the expenditure, aside from capital expenditure, from \$23,503,158 in 1878 to \$37,585,025 in 1894.

3.—Because in the face of falling revenue, hard times, and a deficit for 1893-4 of over \$1,200,000, it appropriated in the session of 1894 over \$4,000,000 for railway subsidies, the objects of the grants in the majority of cases being to give aid to its candidates in the coming elections.

4.—Because it has squandered the public lands in the North-West by lavish and unnecessary grants to railway corporations, having granted in this way up to April last 44,242,298 acres, which is twice the quantity of land at present under cultivation in the Dominion.

5.—Because it has squandered public moneys in worthless investments made to serve the purposes of friends, such as the Tay Canal, which cost \$476,128 and last year yielded revenue to the amount of \$136.

6.—Because it has superannuated civil servants in the prime of life to make places for its own retainers, and has brought the superannuation service to that point when the receipts last year were \$63,433 and the payments \$263,710.

7.—Because it has copied the worst features of American political rascality in the infamous Gerrymander Act of 1882.

8.—Because by the "Franchise Act of 1885" it ceased to permit the Provincial lists to be used for Dominion elections, and adopted an expensive partizan scheme for making Dominion lists, with power to perpetrate gross outrages; and has given the country but one revision on an average each three years, costing in each instance over \$250,000.

9.—Because it went to the country at the last general election under false pretences, professing to be on the point of securing a reciprocity treaty with the United States, when no negotiations were in progress and no prospect of securing such a treaty existed.

10.—Because it has distributed 25,000 square miles of timber limits among its friends and supporters regardless of value and without consideration.

11.—Because it has utterly destroyed the independence of Parliament and secured the support of a slavish majority by gifts to members and their friends of timber limits, railway subsidies and other favors.

12.—Because it makes no attempt to secure purity of administration, but on the contrary is governing the country by the most shameless and corrupt methods.

13.—Because it is not an economical government but is responsible for a system of extravagance and waste in every department.

14.—Because, when the country is staggering under a burden of debt and taxation, no effort is made to reduce the debt or diminish the expenditure.

15.—Because the tariff is not adjusted for the purpose of securing the revenue necessary for the economical administration of public affairs in the easiest way for the people, but on the contrary is made the weapon of rings and combines through the operation of which they exclude foreign goods and secure the power to charge exorbitant prices for their own wares.

16.—Because the promises made on behalf of the National Policy were foundationless and false. It has neither checked the exodus, nor given a home market for our farm products, nor increased the price of such products, nor secured prosperity for the country.

17.—Because the extravagance of the Government obliged the country to face a deficit of over \$1,200,000 last year and will probably result in a deficit of \$5,000,000 for the year 1894-5.

18.—Because the buried secrets of peculations, frauds and maladministration in the various departments should be exposed to the light of day, and the accounts and records should be investigated by men who are not interested in concealing facts.

19.—Because Canada is nearly at a standstill and her people are disheartened. Her present rulers are incompetent, and their policy worse than a failure. We want new men, new methods, a new policy.

20.—Because Parliamentary enquiry into grave charges made against members of the Government in the Caron case was refused, the character and allegations of said charges changed by the Government to suit its own purpose, and the emasculated indictment thus prepared referred to a commission chosen by itself before which acquittal was foreordained.

21.—Because their policy has led to the scheduling of Canadian cattle in Great Britain and the quarantining of Canadian cattle in the United States.



# STRONG RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE LIBERALS.

## Reasons why the Liberal Party should be entrusted with the administration of the Government of Canada.

1.—Because when in power from 1873 to 1878 it gave the country wise and just laws and an honest, prudent, economical administration of the public affairs, free from the stain of reckless waste, foul corruption and shameless disregard of public and private interests.

2.—Because when in power it increased the public debt only to the extent rendered necessary by the obligations incurred and public works undertaken by its predecessors in office.

3.—Because it only increased the expenditure from \$23,316,316 in 1873-4 to \$23,503,158 in 1877-8, a difference of \$186,842, and an average annual increase during the period of \$46,710.

4.—Because, though it was obliged to add to the debt and the interest charge in meeting obligations incurred by the administration preceding it, the controllable expenditure during its term of office was reduced to the extent of over \$1,700,000.

5.—Because it adhered to the just and proper policy of a low revenue tariff, calculated to meet the absolute needs of an economically administered Government—a tariff which would have proved sufficient for its needs upon the revival of business in 1879.

6.—Because it made an honest effort to secure reciprocal trade with the United States through the negotiation of the Brown draft-treaty.

7.—Because the Liberal party again placed in power will stop the increase of the public debt and commence its reduction as quickly and as rapidly as possible.

8.—Will reduce expenditure and cut down expenses with all possible rapidity.

9.—Will place the tariff, with due regard to all important interests, upon a purely revenue basis, so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States, and will give due consideration to the interests of the farmer, the fisherman, the lumberman, the miner and the laborer.

10.—Will secure purity, honesty and economy in the administration of public affairs.

11.—Will seek for extended trade relations with the United States.

12.—Will seek for wider markets in other countries whenever opportunity may offer to push our trade.

13.—Will recognize the actual settler as the natural heir to the public lands, and will reserve the same for his occupancy upon reasonable terms and conditions.

14.—Will seek to protect labor and the results of labor from the designs of unjust combinations and monopolies.

15.—Will seek for such a remodelling and reconstructing of the Canadian Senate as will make it amenable to public sentiment and a useful branch of the national legislature.

16.—Will remedy the abuses of the Gerrymander Act and cause electoral districts to conform to county boundaries so far as the principle of representation by population will permit.

17.—Will repeal the "Franchise Act," save its cost to the country, avoid its inconveniences and abuses, and return to the simply and cheaply prepared Provincial lists for Dominion elections.

18.—Will vote no money for railway bonuses or public works for the mere purpose of purchasing local support for Government candidates, but in all such matters will be governed by the paramount consideration of the general public interest.

19.—Will strive to check the exodus by securing general prosperity, reduced taxation, better markets, honest administration and general satisfaction with our political condition.

20.—Will grapple with the abuses of the superannuation system and aim to remove the present heavy charge upon the general revenue by equalizing superannuation receipts and disbursements.

21.—Will stand by the Platform adopted at the National Liberal Convention.

## LESSONS OF THE TARIFF QUESTION AS REVEALED BY THE TRADE TABLES.

The Trade Tables of Canada are the official record of its business with foreign countries. The volume of business is shown by the quantities and values of its exports and imports, embracing merchandize, coin and bullion. These are entered at the various Customs Houses under well defined and uniform regulations, and the returns are regularly sent in to the Department of Customs at Ottawa, where they are examined and compiled into annual reports known as the Trade Tables. They do not show exactly, like a merchant's books, the net gains or losses of foreign trade. The cost of such items as freight, commissions and insurance is not known, and so an exact balance cannot be struck. But the Tables are prepared in the same way year after year, and the lacking items are the same; consequently the figures of one year or period of years will compare properly with those of another year or period. There will be gains in the trade of some articles and losses in that of others; but the aggregate of gain or loss will be shown in the difference between the values of exports and imports. The merchandize, coin and bullion sent out of Canada to other countries exchange for the merchandize, coin and bullion brought into it from those countries. International trade is only another term for international exchange, and the business is carried on at a gain or loss according as the value of imports in the Trade Tables is greater or less than the value of exports. If a man barter one article of merchandize worth to him \$100 for another article worth \$120, he is a gainer of \$20 by the transaction. So it is with our foreign trade. It is shown to be conducted at a profit if the value of our imports is greater than the value of our exports—if merchandize of less value exchanges for merchandize of greater value. This is the true idea of the "balance of trade."

To illustrate: Cheese, live stock and grain entered for export in Montreal at \$100,000 sells at an advance of say 25 per cent. in Liverpool, after freight and all other expenses are paid. With the proceeds, \$125,000 worth of dry goods and hardware are purchased in the British markets for shipment to Canada, and are entered for that amount at the Montreal Customs House. The profit to Canada according to the Trade Tables is \$25,000, although it is certain that the importer will add to the invoice price the freight, insurance, commission, etc., besides a percentage on the aggregate for further profit. But suppose the Government to step in; it does, to levy a tax of say 10 per cent. upon the imported goods, then the country's profit is reduced from \$25,000 to \$12,500; or if the rate be 15 per cent. it is reduced to \$6,250; or if it be 25 per cent. the country is a loser by this adventure in foreign trade to the extent of \$6,250.

Now, one of the uses of the Trade Tables published by the Government, is to show the operation of our foreign trade—what it might be under free trade or a revenue tariff and what it is under a high protective tariff. The following table presents a comparison for two periods since Confederation—first, the eleven fiscal years 1868-78, under a tariff for revenue, and second, the sixteen years 1879-94 under a tariff for protection:

Foreign Commerce of Canada for the Eleven Years 1868-78, and the Fifteen Years 1879-94, including Coin and Bullion.

### 1868-78 (11 YEARS REVENUE TARIFF)

Imports .. .. .	\$1,062,052,375
Exports .. .. .	841,623,764
Balance in favor of Canada .. .. .	\$ 220,428,611 if no duties were levied
Duties paid .. .. .	132,468,685
Balance in favor of Canada .. .. .	\$ 87,959,926 less duties paid



## 1879-94 (16 YEARS PROTECTIVE TARIFF)

Imports .. . . .	\$1,686,063,503
Exports .. . . .	1,537,944,813
Balance in favor of Canada .. . . .	\$ 148,118,690 if no duties were levied
Duties paid .. . . .	326,238,930
Balance against Canada, .. . . .	\$ 178,119,240 less duties paid

In the first period, under a Revenue Tariff, every \$100 of exports exchanged for \$126.20 of imports gross, or for \$110.45 net after payment of customs duties.

In the second period, under a Protective Tariff, every \$100 of exports exchanged for \$109.65 of imports gross, or for \$88.42 net after payment of customs duties.

Under a Revenue Tariff the net gain of Canada's foreign trade was \$10.45 on every \$100 of exports.

Under a Protective Tariff the net loss of Canada's foreign trade was \$11.58 on every \$100 of exports.

The Protective Tariff is producing two disastrous effects on Canada's foreign trade.

(1) By increasing the cost of production at home it lessens the profits realized on the exchange of merchandize. Note that while the \$841,623,764 of exports under the low tariff realized \$220,428,611, the \$1,437,944,813 under a high tariff realized only \$148,118,690—in each case before the duties are taken off.

(2) It is taxing Canada's foreign trade to the death. Note that while under the Revenue Tariff the net profit after paying customs duties to the Government was \$87,959,926, the net loss under the Protective Tariff has been \$178,119,240.

These are the lessons of the Tariff Question in Canada, as revealed by the Government's Trade Tables.

## INDEX.

	Page
Administration, Purity of .. . . . . .	11, 28, 39, 40, 43, 51
Agriculture Implements .. . . . . .	21, 22
"        Schedule .. . . . . .	26, 27
Baldwin, Robert .. . . . . .	3, 4
Blind Shares and Sir Mackenzie Bowell .. . . . . .	31, 32
Blake, Hon. Edward.. . . . . .	3, 8
"        "                  on Liberal Platform .. . . . . .	8
Brown, George .. . . . . .	3, 5
Bridge Scandal, Curran .. . . . . .	33, 34, 36
British Connection .. . . . . .	5, 50
"        Institutions .. . . . . .	50
Bright's, John, advice to the people .. . . . . .	7
Bright, John .. . . . . .	4
Cartwright, Sir Richard .. . . . . .	36
Charlton, John .. . . . . .	43, 50
C. P. R., Land Grants to .. . . . . .	42, 43
Caron, Sir A. P. .. . . . . .	28, 31
Cattle, Canadian, scheduled in British markets .. . . . . .	15, 56
"        Canadian, quarantined in United States .. . . . . .	27, 56
"        Exports to United States .. . . . . .	25, 26
"        Duty on in United States .. . . . . .	26, 27
Committees, Polling Districts .. . . . . .	6, 7
Convention, National Liberal .. . . . . .	8
Corruption .. . . . . .	11, 28, 35
"        a Few Examples of .. . . . . .	28
"        the Caron Case .. . . . . .	28, 29, 30
"        the McGreevy Conspiracy and the Langevin-Caron Reptile Fund .. . . . . .	30, 31
"        Bowell (Sir Mackenzie) and the Blind Shares .. . . . . .	31, 32
"        Sale of Public Office—the Cochrane Case .. . . . . .	32
"        Buying up a Member of Parliament—the Turcotte Case .. . . . . .	32, 33
"        Sales of Land to Speculators .. . . . . .	42
"        the Timber Limits Grab .. . . . . .	42
"        Land Grants to Railways .. . . . . .	42
Contract Section B .. . . . . .	34, 35
Curran Bridge Scandal .. . . . . .	33, 34, 36
Cochrane, Edward, Conservative M.P. .. . . . . .	32
"        Case—Corrupt Sale of Public Offices .. . . . . .	32
Demand Strictest Economy—Decreased Expenditure .. . . . . .	11, 14, 35, 40, 52
Debt .. . . . . .	14
"        The Public, Increase in .. . . . . .	14, 35, 52, 55
Edgar, J. D., M.P. .. . . . . .	29, 30, 32
Expenditure .. . . . . .	14
"        Public, Increased Alarmingly .. . . . . .	36, 37
"        Increase of the Controllable .. . . . . .	37, 38, 52, 55

Extravagance .. . . .	14, 33, 35, 38, 51, 55
Enquiry, Refusal of .. . . .	34, 40
Enlarged Markets—Reciprocity .. . . .	10, 13, 24
Favoritism and Extravagance .. . . .	33
Freer Trade—Reduced Taxation .. . . .	9, 13
Franchise, Oppose Dominion—Favor the Provincial Franchise .. . . .	5, 11, 44, 54
"    Dominion Act Objectionable in Every Way .. . . .	44
"    Dominion Act, Enormous Cost .. . . .	45
"    Dominion Act, Sir John Thompson's Views .. . . .	45
Gerrymander, Against the—County Boundaries Should Be Preserved .. . . .	5, 12, 46, 48, 54
Laurier, Hon. Wilfrid .. . . .	3, 50
Land for the Settler—Not for the Speculator .. . . .	11, 41, 43, 50, 51
Liberal Platform .. . . .	9
Lister, J. F., M.P. .. . . .	34
Lists, Provincial .. . . .	11, 44, 54
Mackenzie, Alexander .. . . .	3, 5, 17, 35, 36, 52, 55
"    William Lyon .. . . .	4
Macdonald, Sir John, Resolutions 1877 and 1878 .. . . .	14, 16
"    "    Speech on Redistribution Act of 1872 .. . . .	47
Mills, Hon. David .. . . .	44
Mulock, Wm., M.P. .. . . .	50
National Policy, or N. P. .. . . .	13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19
N. P.—Decreased Farm Property .. . . .	13, 17
"    Oppressed the Masses .. . . .	18, 19
"    Caused Loss of Population .. . . .	13, 17
"    Impeded Commerce .. . . .	14, 15, 16
"    Discriminated Against Britain .. . . .	14, 15
"    Tax Does Not All Go to Treasury .. . . .	19
"    A Corrupting Agency .. . . .	13, 23, 35, 38, 51, 55
"    Promises of 1878 .. . . .	13, 20
"    and Trade With Britain .. . . .	14
"    and Reciprocity and Tall Chimneys .. . . .	16
"    and the Exodus .. . . .	17
"    What Have the Farmers Benefited? .. . . .	17, 18
"    Manufacturers' Profits and Farmers' Profit .. . . .	18
"    Taxes Taken by Manufacturers .. . . .	19
"    Where the Revenue Receives No Benefit .. . . .	19
"    Specific Duties Under .. . . .	20, 21
"    Extracts from Tariff .. . . .	21, 23, 58, 59
Organize and Work .. . . .	6, 7
Paterson, William, M.P. .. . . .	44
Patron Platform .. . . .	50
Polling District—Committee .. . . .	6, 7
Population—Tory Promises .. . . .	13, 14
"    The Census and the Exodus .. . . .	17
Platform, Liberal .. . . .	9
"    Patron .. . . .	50
Principles of the Liberal Party .. . . .	4-6, 8
Purity of Administration—condemn corruption .. . . .	11, 28, 36, 50, 52



Prohibition .. . . .	13
Plebiscite .. . . .	13
Principles, Policy and Platform, Liberal .. . . .	1, 2, 8
Platform, Liberal .. . . .	7, 8, 9, 57
" Patron .. . . .	50
Protection, Tariff (see Tariff) .. . . .	58, 59
Promises and Performance—National Policy, 1878 .. . . .	13-20
Protection Radically Unsound .. . . .	9, 13-23, 28-35
Reciprocity with the United States .. . . .	10
" Promised by the N. P. .. . . .	13, 16
" Benefits of .. . . .	25, 26
" Sham Negotiations by Conservatives .. . . .	25, 26
" History of Old Treaty .. . . .	53, 57
Responsible Government—Independence of Parliament .. . . .	11, 39, 28-40, 50, 52
Railways, Land Grants to .. . . .	42, 43
Revenue Tariff. (See Trade, Freer Trade) .. . . .	58, 59
Senate, Defective—Amend the Constitution .. . . .	12, 49
" Abolish .. . . .	52
Trade with Britain .. . . .	14
" with the United States .. . . .	25, 26, 27
" Schedules of .. . . .	25, 26, 27
" "Balance of" .. . . .	13, 14, 58, 59
Trade, Freer .. . . .	9, 13, 53
Trade Tables .. . . .	58, 59
Tariff .. . . .	5, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 53, 58, 59
" Britain's Customs .. . . .	19
" Revision (in 1894) .. . . .	20
" Extracts from .. . . .	21
" Dominion Customs .. . . .	9, 10, 13, 23
" For Revenue .. . . .	52, 53, 56
" Against Great Britain .. . . .	9, 10, 13, 14, 15
" Decreased Farm Property .. . . .	13, 17
" Oppressed the masses .. . . .	18, 19

